DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 111 470 JC 750 491

TITLE	Community College Faculty Collective Bargaining: Report and Recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Community College Faculty Collective Bargaining to the Senate Select Committee.
INSTITUTION	Washington State Legislature, Olympia. Senate.
REPORT NO	SR-74-271
PUB DATE	Jan 75
NOTE	63p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$3.32 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS	Administrative Personnel; *Collective Bargaining; *College Faculty; *Community Colleges; Educational Legislation; *Junior Colleges; Local Unions; Part Time Teachers; Questionnaires; *State Surveys; Tables (Data); Teacher Salaries; Trustees
IDENTIFIERS	*Washington

ABSTRACT

A survey of almost 6,500 community college faculty, trustees, students, presidents, and administrators was conducted to study the question of faculty relations in the Washington State community college system, with special emphasis on collective bargaining. Respondents (38 percent of the questionnaire distribution) favored including part-time faculty in the bargaining unit by a 70.6 percent margin, and department/division chairmen by a 70.2 percent margin, but were against including students by a 77 percent margin. Other results indicated: 52.2 percent of the respondents were against administrators, other than the president, being empowered to bargain independently; 64.3 percent were in favor of negotiations at the local rather than the state level; 75.3 percent were against the idea of limiting collective bargaining to the traditional economic issues of wages and hours; 54.3 percent favored both collective bargaining and internal governance. Responses were evenly divided on the advisability of a statewide salary schedule for community college faculty. Based on the survey results, a replacement of the Community College Professional Negotiations Law with a collective bargaining law designed specifically for community colleges is recommended. Bargaining should be conducted at the local level. (NHM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED111470

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Washington State Senate

COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACULTY COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

OF THE

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

ON

COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACULTY COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

TO THE

SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE

(SR 74-271)

JC 750 491

OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON
JANUARY, 1975

COMMUNITY COLLEGE COLLECTIVE BARGAINING STUDY

(SFR 74-271)

STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

Senator Gordon Sandison - Higher Education Committee - Chairman

Senator Gary Grant - - - - Labor Committee

Senator Sam Guess - - - - Higher Education Committee

Senator Dan Marsh - - - - Higher Education Committee

Senator Jim Matson - - - Labor Committee

Staff:

Jim Bricker, Staff Director - Senate Research Center

Marilyn Hammond - - - - - - - Senate Minority Caucus

Carolyn McCalden - - - - - - Senate Higher Education Committee

Jeff Riddle - - - - - - - - - - Senate Labor Committee

ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

John Petrich - - - Tacoma - Co-Chairman

John Ryder - - - - Seattle - Co-Chairman

Representing

Pinckney Rohrback - Trustees' Association (Shoreline Community College)

Joe Malik - - - - - Presidents' Association (Grays Harbor Community College)

Dave Karber - - - - Departmental Chairman (Everett Community College)

Lloyd Frissell - - Fulltime Faculty Representative (North Seattle Community College)

Edith Clarke - - - Parttime Faculty Representative (Bellevue Community College)

Karen Higgins - - - Students' Representative (Green River Community College)

John Terrey - - - - State Board for Community College Education

Washington State Senate

January 20, 1975

Governor Daniel J. Evans and
Members of the 1975 Legislature:

I am pleased to transmit to you the report prepared by the Advisory Committee on Community College Collective Bargaining. This report is the result of Senate Resolution 74-271 adopted in April, 1974.

Senate Resolution 74-271 directed the Senate Committee on Higher Education, with the cooperation of the Senate Committee on Labor, to study the question of faculty relations in the community college system with special emphasis on collective bargaining.

The Senate Steering Committee, made up of three members of the Higher Education Committee and two members of the Labor Committee, prepared a study design to carry out the provisions of the Resolution. Pursuant to the design an Advisory Committee was formed with membership from the community college system. The Advisory Committee was chaired by former Senators John Ryder and John Petrich.

In fulfilling its assignment, the Advisory Committee met nine times and conducted a survey of almost 6,500 community college faculty, trustees, students, presidents, and administrators.

Based in large part on the survey results, the Advisory Committee made ten recommendations. The major recommendation calls for the replacement of the Community College Professional Negotiations Law with a collective bargaining law designed specifically for community colleges. Bargaining should be conducted at the local level under the recommendations. The Advisory Committee believed that these two key recommendations are necessary if the system is to continue to meet its responsibilities under the Community College Act of 1967.

Attached is the full report of the Advisory Committee on Community College Collective Bargaining for your consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

COMMITTEE ON HIGHER EDUCATION

Gordon Sandison

GORDON SANDISON
Chairman

GS:pb
CC: Presidents, CORP, Faculty Associations, Trustees and Administrators

STATE OF
WASHINGTON

SENATE RESEARCH CENTER

J. ARNOLD BRICKER, *Staff Director*

MEMORANDUM

DATE: January 10, 1975

TO: Senate Steering Committee on Community College Collective Bargaining:

Senator Gordon Sandison, Chairman
Senator Gary Grant
Senator Sam Guess
Senator Dan Marsh
Senator Jim Matson

FROM: Advisory Committee on Community College Collective Bargaining

SUBJECT: Recommendations and Summary Report

Enclosed for your review are the recommendations of the Advisory Committee in response to Senate Resolution 74-271, and the Study Design adopted by the Senate Higher Education Committee to implement that resolution. In addition to the recommendations this report contains narrative statements which were developed to outline the historic and philosophical considerations on which the positions were based. Also attached are the results of the questionnaire survey which went to all elements of the community college system.

The Advisory Committee met eight times to fulfill the responsibilities assigned by the Steering Committee. The Committee discussions centered on an examination of the current situation with respect to the community college collective bargaining and also to consider bargaining procedural alternatives. One of these meetings was devoted to hearing spokespersons of the two major faculty organizations, the trustees association, and the community college presidents.

The results of the questionnaire have provided insights into the views of various elements of the community college system. An extremely good response to the questionnaire was received, with nearly 60 percent of all categories responding. The exception was part-time faculty, where there was slightly less than a 18 percent response. Presumably, distribution problems affected the response from that category. However, the response was substantial enough so that specific references have been made where appropriate in the report.

JAB:pb

LEGISLATIVE BUILDING OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON 98504 TELEPHONE: (206) 753-6826

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY COLLEGE COLLECTIVE BARGAINING RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Advisory Committee recommends that the current Community College Professional Negotiations Act be replaced by a collective bargaining law designed specifically for community colleges.

2. The Committee, while recognizing that bargaining is a bilateral process at the local level, urges that the Legislature define the role of the State Board in the bargaining process.

3. The Committee recommends that the phrase "to bargain collectively" be defined as the performance of the mutual obligation of the employer and the representative of the employees to meet at reasonable times and confer in good faith with respect to wages, hours, and other terms and conditions of employment,* or the negotiation of an agreement, or any question arising thereunder, and the execution of a written contract incorporating any agreement reached if requested by either party, but such obligation does not compel either party to agree to a proposal or require the making of a concession.

   Matters not specifically within the scope of collective bargaining should be subject to governance procedures and, furthermore, the Advisory Committee strongly urges that workable governance structures be developed on each campus so as to include all components of the campus community.

4. The Committee recognizes that faculty, including librarians and counselors, should be in the bargaining unit; however, the opportunity to bargain--either in the faculty bargaining unit or in a separate unit--should be available to department/division chairmen and administrators. Part-time faculty should be assumed to be included in the faculty bargaining unit unless that group votes to form a separate bargaining unit.

5. The Committee recommends that students should be given the opportunity to express their opinions about the impact of negotiable items on the learning experience.

6. Since the current Professional Negotiations Law does not provide for the selection and certification of bargaining representatives, the Committee recommends that procedures for the selection and certification of bargaining representatives be included in the new Law.

* See Appendix D, "Subjects of Bargaining"

7. The Committee recommends that the rights and obligations of academic employees and the college districts should be clearly defined in the new Law.

8. The Committee recommends that the Act define unfair labor practices for academic employees and the college districts.

9. The Committee recommends that impasse resolution procedures, including mediation, fact-finding, arbitration be defined and be scheduled.

10. Several agencies are now available which might administer a collective bargaining act for community colleges and therefore the Committee recommends that a new agency <u>not</u> be created.

SRC:12/17/74

Policy statements addressed to the Senate Resolution 1974-271

"NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, By the Senate, that the Committee on Higher Education be requested to conduct a study of this issue, including, but not limited to:

(1) The unique process of faculty negotiations at the community college level, in light of the dual authority structure of the system;"

The process of faculty negotiations at the community college level is indeed complicated and frustrated by the dual authority structure of the community college system. Specifically, the Community College Act of 1967, and thereafter amended, outlines the responsibilities of both local boards of trustees and the State Board for Community College Education. The responsibilities of the State Board for Community College Education and the respective local boards of trustees are not mutually exclusive. The consequence of this lack of exclusivity is that both boards have jurisdiction on some items thereby creating two levels of policy setting authority.

The present Professional Negotiations Act calls for negotiations to be conducted at the local level.

((The questionnaire results indicate that 64% of the responses favored negotiations at this level. See Appendix E2))

The Advisory Committee on Collective Bargaining feels this is the appropriate arena for bargaining to take place, but the parties to bargaining are frustrated, particularly from a faculty point of view, when local boards cannot agree to certain items without having them reviewed and possibly modified or denied by the State Board for Community College Education. Even under a traditional collective bargaining bill, there would be significant problems created by this dual authority structure. While the Advisory Committee believes that many of the significant problems with the current Professional Negotiations Act can be remedied with a new collective bargaining bill for the community colleges, there will continue to be complications and frustrations under the present state system of governance.

It is the view of the Committee that this situation can be remedied by collective bargaining legislation that provides for agreements between local boards of trustees and faculty organizations to be binding unless found to be invalid by a court of law. It is not workable for other state agencies to have authority to modify or deny written agreements or policies dealing with bargainable issues based upon their own interpretation.

Recommendation No. 1. Therefore, the Advisory Committee recommends that the current Community College Professional Negotiations Act be replaced by a collective bargaining law designed specifically for community colleges.

"(2) The appropriate roles of trustees, administrators, and negotiating units in the community college district, as well as that of the State Board for Community College Education; and"

The Community College Act of 1967 calls for each community college to establish programs which are necessary and relevant to the community being served. Indeed, the very nature of the community college philosophy focuses attention on the community and its educational needs for all persons eighteen years of age and older. The success of the colleges requires that each campus have maximum autonomy within a coordinated system of community colleges. Consistent with this philosophy, colleges must be free to change and to modify their program offerings in light of the changing needs of their communities and the citizens who attend. Local boards of trustees have the responsibility to establish policies which lead to the achievement of these objectives. Local administrators and faculty are called upon to assist in the formulation and the implementation of these policies. This local approach to policy development and implementation is critical to the charge and the success of the community college system. In order to preserve the very nature of the community colleges and to enhance meaningful collective bargaining, the ultimate responsibility for the operation of the respective institutions must reside at the local level. The State Board for Community College Education and the Attorney General's Office should attempt to interpret legislative intent but local boards, not the State Board for Community College Education, must be held accountable for carrying out such intent as it relates to bargainable issues.

The State Board for Community College Education has broad authority for managing the community colleges of the state. Perhaps the most significant problem is the conflict between statutory provisions; on the one hand, the State Board for Community College Education has the responsibility to manage and to be held accountable for the operation of the system, and on the other hand, the local boards of trustees have responsibility to provide maximum educational opportunities at the local level within the resources available to them. The Advisory Committee understands and appreciates that legislative intent can better be implemented by a strong centralized authority. However, any such strong centralized authority, when exercised, will at least innibit, and at worst undermine, meaningful collective bargaining at the local level. The alternative would seem to be collective bargaining by the faculties of the community colleges of this state with the State Board for Community College Education. While such an arrangement may seem simpler and more orderly, it would be detrimental to the individual colleges and their reason for existence. Moving collective bargaining to the state level necessitates a statewide salary schedule. If all economic matters for both professional and classified personnel were handled at the state level, the role of local boards of trustees would become largely ceremonial and only advisory in nature. When the staffs of community colleges feel that their employer resides in the capital city rather than in the local

community, then loyalties and commitments will ultimately shift away from the local community and severely threaten the "community nature" of our community college system. Therefore, the best solution appears to be one which places the maximum autonomy at the local level.

To this end the Committee makes several recommendations:

Recommendation No. 2. The Committee, while recognizing that bargaining is a bilateral process at the local level, urges that the Legislature define the role of the State Board in the bargaining process.

Recommendation No. 4. The Committee recognizes that faculty, including librarians and counselors, should be in the bargaining unit; however, the opportunity to bargain--either in the faculty bargaining unit or in a separate unit--should be available to department/division chairmen and administrators. Part-time faculty should be assumed to be included in the faculty bargaining unit unless that group votes to form a separate bargaining unit.

Recommendation No. 6. Since the current Professional Negotiations Law does not provide for the selection and certification of bargaining representatives, the Committee recommends that procedures for the selection and certification of bargaining representatives be included in the new Law.

Recommendation No. 7. The Committee recommends that the rights and obligations of academic employees and the college districts should be clearly defined in the new law.

Recommendation No. 8. The Committee recommends that the Act define unfair labor practices for academic employees and the college district.

Recommendation No. 10. Several agencies are now available which might administer a collective bargaining act for community colleges and therefore the Committee recommends that a new agency not be created.

"(3) The question of the possible state interest in a statewide salary schedule; and"

The Advisory Committee on Collective Bargaining believes that a statewide salary schedule for community colleges would not be consistent with the philosophy of the community college system or with sound governance procedures at the local level.

((The questionnaire results indicate that 47% of the responses favored a statewide salary schedule for community college faculty, whereas 50% were against a schedule. See Appendix E2))

The Committee recognizes that there is a disparity in the salaries provided community college personnel. This disparity has been created in part by successful negotiations by some faculty organizations; it has been perpetuated and even enhanced by percentage salary increases provided by the legislature during the last four years; it is the result of a community college system made up of old institutions as well as relatively new institutions; and it is also caused by faculty whose training and experience varies considerably from institution to institution. In recent years, the matter of disparity has been demonstrated by comparing the average salary paid at a given institution with the average salaries paid at other institutions in the community college system. While this comparison is one indication of disparity, it does not take into account many of the factors identified above.

Any system for adminstering a statewide salary schedule would logically carry with it standards for workload, number of contract days, office hours, and other relevent indicators of work. To put all of these factors into any set of statewide standards could be detrimental to the management of the institutions and place unnecessary constraints on both boards of trustees and faculty organizations.

It could be detrimental because local boards of trustees and administrators may no longer have flexibility in the management of their resources. It may also be very difficult for institutions to change their programs and the use of their resources in response to local educational needs.

At present, salaries and benefits of classified personnel are controlled by the Higher Education Personnel Board. Moreover, salaries, wages and fringe benefits for all personnel now amount to approximately 82%-90% of an institution's budget. If a standard salary schedule along with standard workload definitions were implemented on a statewide basis, there would be little left to discuss at the bargaining table. In short, a statewide salary schedule would provide for equity, but such equity would be gained at the expense of local management flexibility, institutional responsiveness, and decision making which is relevant to local needs and conditions.

Policy statements addressed to policy questions in the study design of SR 74-271

a. Does the present professional negotiations law for community colleges need to be revised?

The Advisory Committee on Collective Bargaining believes that the current Professional Negotiations Law for Community Colleges is no longer adequate. While it is probably possible, by extensive admendments, to alter the present law in such a way that it would be more acceptable to the parties of negotiations, this is not a practical solution. On the basis of its investigation, the Advisory Committee has concluded that there is insufficient confidence in the current law and that a new community college collective bargaining law would be preferable.

Results of the questionnaire, which the Committee used as a part of the investigation, indicate that all elements of the community college system (34%) favor a new bargaining law exclusively for the community college system. The second choice (21%) was a higher education bill which would include two and four year institutions. Third choice (16%) was to favor a comprehensive bill which would cover all levels of education.

b. What fundamental differences exist between the current community college professional negotiations statute and model collective bargaining law?

A fundamental difference which exists between the current community college professional negotiations statute and more traditional collective bargaining laws has to do with the scope of negotiations. The scope of the current Professional Negotiations Act includes, but is not limited to, curriculum, textbook selection, in-service training, student teaching programs, personnel, hiring and assignment practices, leaves of absence, salaries and salary schedules and non-instructional duties. This scope is considerably broader than exists in traditional collective bargaining legislation. In past years this scope has generally been acceptable to faculty bargaining units, as well as boards of trustees. Faculty bargaining units traditionally favor broad scope. Boards of trustees have found this scope to be acceptable because they have not been required by law to reach agreement, but rather could adopt policy after receiving "the considered professional judgment of the academic staff prior to the final adoption" of proposed policies. The "meet and confer" provision is now apparently unacceptable to faculty groups. Herein lies the dilemma on the issue of scope. Faculty bargaining units desire to bargain on a broad list of topics in order to have more impact on district policy. They believe that boards of trustees should not just be required to receive the considered professional judgment of the academic staff, but rather they should be required to reach agreement on all bargainable issues and that the scope of such issues should remain broad in the interest of full faculty participation in decision making.

Boards of trustees believe that the scope of collective bargaining should be consistent with traditional collective bargaining legislation, that is, salaries, workload, insurance, retirement and other such fringe benefits. Trustees feel that if they are required to reach agreement on all of the topics listed in the current law, then their ability to carry out their legal obligations as a board is seriously threatened.

Recommendation No. 3. The Committee recommends that the phrase "to bargain collectively" be defined as the performance of the mutual obligation of the employer and the representative of the employees to meet at resonable times and confer in good faith with respect to wages, hours, and other terms and conditions of employment, or the negotiation of an agreement, or any question arising thereunder, and the execution of a written contract incorporating any agreement reached if requested by either party, but such obligation does not compel either party to agree to a proposal or require the making of a concession.

Matters not specifically within the scope of collective bargaining should be subject to governance procedures and, furthermore, the Advisory Committee strongly urges that workable governance structures be developed on each campus so as to include all components of the campus community./1

Another matter of considerable concern to trustees is the prospect of disputes ultimately being resolved by a third party when scope is as broad as it is in the Professional Negotiations Act. Trustees are supportive of mediation, fact finding and even voluntary arbitration, when necessary, but believe strongly that they must ultimately make final judgment consistent with the mission of the institution and in the interest of the public and the students being served.

A second major difference between more traditional collective bargaining acts and the current Professional Negotiations Law is in the matter of dispute resolution. The Professional Negotiations Act provides for the use of impasse committees, but does not provide for any other mechanisms for resolving disputes. The Advisory Committee believes that a series of procedures should be defined and the parties should be obligated to follow such steps within a reasonable time schedule. An alternative to defining such steps in law would be to require local boards and faculty organizations to work out their own methods for dispute resolution and have them included in an agreement for specific period of time.

/1 The Committee agreed that scope must be addressed if a collective bargaining bill were to be drafted and suggested this for consideration. Experts contend that "terms and conditions of employment" is sufficiently broad to allow the concerned parties to negotiate matters to which they have been accustomed. See Appendix D - memo on subjects of bargaining under N.L.R. Act as it has been interpreted by the National Labor Relations Board and the courts.

c. *What are the differences between local and state boards in their abilities to implement the professional negotiations law?*

The State Board for Community College Education is not mentioned in the Professional Negotiations Law. That law, 28B.52.010, has as its purpose "...the establishment of orderly methods of communication between academic employees and the community college districts by which they are employed." Local boards of trustees have the authority as well as the responsibility to meet and confer and negotiate with the delegated representatives of the faculty. This process may be reduced to writing upon the request of either party and may constitute a written contract that will not exceed three years.

As suggested earlier, this process is made more difficult because the Community College Act of 1967 gives broad financial controls to the State Board for Community College Education; consequently, they may review and modify local budgets, Greenwood v. State Board for Community Colleges, 82 Wn. 2d 667,513 P.2d 57(1973). The State Board for Community College Education has tended to utilize this authority by adopting guidelines within which local negotiations may take place. This authority is granted by the Community College Act but puts definite restrictions on the negotiations process and consequently frustrates both parties at the bargaining table. In summary, only local boards of trustees can implement the Professional Negotiations Law; the State Board for Community College Education seems to have authority to restrict the nature of such negotiations and probably modify the agreements resulting from such negotiations.

d. *Do local boards have sufficient statutory authority?*

Based upon the statement in paragraph c. above, it is the opinion of the Advisory Committee that local boards do not have sufficient statutory authority relative to collective bargaining. Perhaps it would be more accurate to state that the authority that they do have can be restricted or modified by another level of government in ways which inhibit and frustrate the process. It is the opinion of the committee that this basic dilemma can be solved with a different collective bargaining bill if the problem of the dual authority structure is recognized. The solution to this problem will necessitate less state level authority and control over bargainable issues with the responsibility for collective bargaining being placed at the local level. It is the opinion of the Committee that the charge of the community college system, by virtue of the act which established the system, strongly suggests that the mission of the respective institutions can only be effectively carried out with local authority and local responsibility, as is now true in the common school system.

((The questionnaire results indicate that 64% of the responses favored negotiations at the local level; 32% were in favor of negotiations at the state level. See Appendix E2))

e. To what degree would a statewide salary schedule enhance or inhibit professional negotiations?

The Advisory Committee believes that a statewide salary schedule for community college professional employees would inhibit negotiations.

((The questionnaire responses indicate that 47% of the responses favored a statewide salary schedule; 50% were against. See Appendix E2))

A statewide system of salary administration would logically be administered by a state agency. Such is already the case with all classified employees in the community college system. If there is to be a reasonable process for collective bargaining at the local level, then economic matters must be a part of that process. Many educational policy matters which appear not to have economic consequences do, in fact, require modifications in a local budget. Virtually all matters which relate to programs and services involve personnel where salaries and other economic matters immediately come into play. Should all economic questions regarding personnel be adminstered at the state level, then there would be very little flexibility in local decision making or in collective bargaining. Without responsibility for salary administration and related workload matters, local boards would have little with which to bargain. Such a process would surely frustrate faculty organizations in their efforts to improve salaries and related working conditions.

It is true that all bargaining, including salary matters, could be handled on a statewide basis and the negotiations process could be carried on at that level, but for reasons found in several places in this statement such a process would severely limit the ability of local colleges to manage their institutions in the most appropriate manner in light of local needs. It is the view of the Advisory Committee that a plan for statewide administration of salary would not be in the interest of local colleges, local faculty organizations, or to the students and community being served.

f. How effective are the present mechanisms for settling disputes?

Probably the single most important weakness of the current Professional Negotiations Law is its mechanism for settling disputes. The present method calls for the Director of the State Board for Community College Education to (1) determine whether, in fact, an impasse exists, and (2) if in his judgment an impasse does exist, appoint an impasse committee to carry out a mediation function. The Advisory Committee has concluded that an impasse resolution mechanism should not be established by the State Board for Community College Education, primarily because it has management responsibility for the system. It is extremely difficulty for the staff of the State Board for Community College Education to appear to be neutral and participate in impasse resolution when they have such significant management responsibility. The Advisory Committee

believes that a collective bargaining bill should call for the resolution of disputes in one of two ways: (1) define in law the procedures for impasse resolution; or (2) allow for the procedures which govern dispute resolution to be negotiated at the local level by the parties to negotiations. In this case, if the parties were unable to agree on impasse resolution procedures, resolution could be handled by an outside arbiter or a panel of arbiters agreed upon by the parties. Recent experience with impasse resolution and strikes in the community college system suggests that federal mediation has been one successful avenue to dispute resolution. This avenue would be possible under either (1) or (2) identified above.

Recommendation No. 9. Therefore, the Committee recommends that impasse, mediation, fact-finding, arbitration and any other dispute resolution procedure be defined and be scheduled.

g. What is the appropriate role, if any, for students in the bargaining process?

Collective bargaining has always been a bilateral process. The parties to the process are always employees and employers. Traditionally the consumer has had no part to play in collective bargaining, even though the result of such bargaining may result in higher prices, inflation, and other factors of deep concern to the consumer. This tradition in bargaining has carried over to the public sector in its relatively brief history of collective bargaining. The parties at the bargaining table have been employees and employers. The results of the questionnaire distributed by our Committee would indicate that, with the exception of students, all other persons represented in the community college system believe that students should not be included in the bargaining process.

((The questionnaire results indicate that 77% of the responses believed that students should not be included in the bargaining process. See Appendix E2))

This view is consistent nationally with the tradition of higher education collective bargaining.

The Advisory Committee, however, is mindful of some important differences in the public sector which may merit further consideration on the issue of student participation in the collective bargaining process. Educational institutions exist for students. Students pay tuition and fees at the beginning of a term and have every right to expect that their term will be completed and they will be able to earn credit in all courses for which they have enrolled. Work slowdowns, work stoppages and strikes have somewhat greater consequences to students than they have to the consumer in the private sector. For these reasons the Advisory Committee believes that students do have a direct interest in the outcome of the collective bargaining process in higher education.

They should not be participants in the bargaining process but their role as observers could be a constructive influence on the parties and could contribute to safeguarding sound educational decisions.

Recommendation No. 5. Therefore, the Committee recommends that students should be given the opportunity to express their opinions about the impact of negotiable items on the learning experience.

h. What are the similarities between four-year schools and community colleges regarding their formal bargaining processes?

The Advisory Committee did not undertake a specific inquiry into the question of the similarities and differences between the community college system and the four year public colleges and universities. This question, does however, deserve some attention, as indicated by the response to the questionnaire: the second choice of respondents for legislation was a combined community college and four year faculty collective bargaining procedure.

Since historically the community colleges have had close ties with the K-12 system and inherited the K-12 professional negotiation procedures, this vote may be a bit surprising to some. However, it appears that since the establishment of the community college system in 1967 the clear intent that it be part of the postsecondary system has become fact. Undoubtedly one of the reasons for this is that most new faculty members have not taught in the common school system and therefore their allegiences flow toward the colleges and universities.

But in spite of this affinitive of common identity, the rationale for including the community colleges and the four year institutions in the same collective bargaining bill denies some significant differences. First, the community colleges have operated with a formal professional negotiations procedure since their inception. The four year schools do not have such statutory authority and have primarily relied upon the traditional faculty senate and faculty committee models for influencing decision-making. Secondly, although both systems are funded on formulas the formulas are not similar, which is appropriate to the distinct differences in the missions of the two systems. Thirdly, appropriations at the four year level are directed to the individual institution; for the community college system a single appropriation is made to the state board which then allocates to the institutions.

These fundamental differences, between the two and four year institutions indicate that it is inappropriate at this time to consider a combined community college and four year faculty collective bargaining bill.

APPENDICES

	Page
APPENDIX A - - - - - - - Senate Resolution 74-271 - - - - - - - - - -	1
APPENDIX B - - - - - - - Study Design - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	3
APPENDIX C - - - - - - - Steering and Advisory Committee Roster - -	7
APPENDIX D - - - - - - - Subjects of Bargaining - - - - - - - - - - -	8
APPENDIX E_1 - - - - - - Questionnaire - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	10
APPENDIX E_2 - - - - - - Questionnaire Summary - - - - - - - - - - - -	12
APPENDIX F - - - - - - - RCW 28B.52, Professional Negotiations Act -	44

SRC:1/3/75

IN THE LEGISLATURE
of the
STATE OF WASHINGTON

SENATE RESOLUTION

1974 - 271

By Senators Sandison, Marsh, Donohue, Scott, Metcalf and Odegaard

WHEREAS, The question of district faculty relations at the state's community colleges has developed as an issue of multiple interests and considerable legal complexity; and

WHEREAS, The standing of community college boards of trustees vis-a-vis the State Board of Community College Education in the field of negotiations has been clouded by court interpretation; and

WHEREAS, Legislation adopted in 1973 revising the Community College Professional Negotiations Act was recognized as remedial rather than comprehensive; and

WHEREAS, Consensus could not be achieved with respect to the most recent legislative proposal relating to faculty negotiations;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, By the Senate, that the Committee on Higher Education be requested to conduct a study of this issue, including, but not limited to:

(1) The unique process of faculty negotiations at the community college level, in light of the dual authority structure of the system;

(2) The appropriate roles of trustees, administrators, and negotiating units in the community college district, as well as that of the State Board for Community College Education; and

(3) The question of the possible state interest in a statewide salary schedule; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Committee on Labor be requested to cooperate in the study, bringing to bear its expertise in the broader field of labor relations in general; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Committee on Higher Education be authorized to hold hearings, take testimony, and seek the expression of views from the full range of interests on this issue; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Committee on Higher Education report its findings, together with appropriate legislative recommendations before the convening of the Forty-fourth Legislature.

I. Sid Snyder, Secretary of the Senate, do hereby certify this is a true and correct copy of Senate Resolution No. 1974-271, adopted by the Senate April 24, 1974.

SID SNYDER
Secretary of the Senate

20

Senate Higher Education Committee
Adopted: June 7, 1974

STUDY DESIGN

SUBJECT: SR 74-271 - Community College Professional Negotiations

PURPOSE:

To review procedures and rights relating to professional negotiations or collective bargaining for faculties of the various community colleges.

BACKGROUND:

In 1965 the legislature enacted professional negotiation rights and procedures for the state's K-14 teachers. When the state community college system was created in 1967, those rights and procedures were extended to community college district faculty.

Professional negotiations for community colleges have been under almost continuous study by both the community college system and the Legislature since 1967. In 1971, a separate statute identical to the 1965 provisions for common schools was established for the community college system. In 1973, the Legislature made several remedial changes to the Community College Professional Negotations Act as developed and endorsed by faculty, trustee and presidential representation. This remedial legislation did not alter the scope of negotiations, but did provide certain clarification in the administrative procedures, and instituted flexibility in the impasse processes.

There is an essential organizational difference between the community college system and the common schools, although the two are similar in that each district in both retains administrative responsibility for its educational programs. The 1967 Community College Act established a local board of trustees for the governing of each community college district and created the State Board for Community College Education, which has broad regulatory and administrative functions for the system under RCW 288.50.090. The State Supreme Court has recently interpreted this section of the code to mean that the State Board has the authority to amend and/or modify local board decisions regarding budgetary issues.

A community college district derives almost all of its funds from the State Board through a general state appropriation. Districts have been expected to respond to general policies as enacted by the Legislature and promulgated by the State Board. A local school district board, on the other hand, although receiving substantial state financial support through the apportionment formula, is responsible for the generation of revenues sufficient to maintain the local schools. This includes the authority to seek a special levy in excess of general revenues.

REQUIREMENTS:

Recommendations due to the 1975 Regular Session.

SPECIAL REQUIREMENT:

The Senate Labor Committee is requested to cooperate in the study by the terms of the resolution.

POLICY QUESTIONS:

a. Does the present professional negotiations law for community colleges need to be revised?

b. What fundamental differences exist between the current community college professional negotations statute and model collective bargaining law?

c. What are the differences between local and state boards in their abilities to implement the professional negotiations law?

d. Do local boards have sufficient statutory authority?

e. To what degree would a statewide salary schedule enhance or inhibit professional negotiations?

f. How effective are the present mechanisms for settling disputes?

g. What is the appropriate role, if any, for students in the bargaining process?

h. What are the similarities between four-year schools and community colleges regarding their formal bargaining processes?

SUB-PROBLEMS:

What changes have occurred since 1967 within the community college system as a result of professional negotiations as they relate to:

a. Part-time faculty

b. Internal governance-faculty senates

c. Tenure

METHODOLOGY:

It is recommended that the Senate Higher Education Committee:

1. Concentrate on the issue of professional negotiations or collective bargaining at the community college level, deferring an inquiry at the four-year level until later.

2. Review developments on individual campuses since enactment of the 1973 amendments to the professional negotiations law.

3. Appoint a steering committee to undertake this study and direct the steering committee to:

a. Review all available information gathered since the 1973 amendments to the Community College Professional Negotiations Act.

b. Review all available information gathered by the House and Senate Labor Committees as it pertains to community colleges in regard to collective bargaining and professional negotiations.

c. Develop a summary of the respective positions of all interested parties of this matter at the community college level.

d. Develop alternative legislative recommendations which would meet the concerns of all parties noted in paragraph "c".

4. The steering committee shall consist of:

Name	Organization
Chairman	Senate Higher Education Committee
Member (Majority Caucus)	" " " "
Member (Minority Caucus)	" " " "
Member (Majority Caucus)	Senate Labor Committee
Member (Minority Caucus)	" " "
Liason Member	House Higher Education Committee

Staff:

Jim Bricker	Senate Higher Education Committee
Marilyn Hammond	Senate Minority Caucus
Jeff Riddle	Senate Labor Committee

As appropriate, the steering committee may arrange with the Attorney General's Office for legal services.

5. The steering committee may establish an advisory committee made up of representatives of the interested parties to assist in identifying problem areas and suggesting alternative solutions.

The advisory committee* to the steering committee shall consist of:

Name	Organization
Citizen Members, Co-Chairmen	Appointed by Steering Committee
Representative	State Board for Community College Education
Representative	Trustees Association
Representative	President's Council
Faculty Reps. (three)	Faculty: One from each of the following categories: 1. Department Chairmen 2. Full-time Faculty 3. Part-time Faculty
Representative	Student Government

* Amended October 5, 1974

The steering committee may request from the Senate Higher Education Committee the appointment of additional faculty and institutional representatives. Such request must be supported by a statement of justification.

6. The steering committee, as assisted by the advisory committee, will periodically present verbal or written briefing to the full committee.

7. The steering committee is authorized to conduct informal meetings with institutional representatives and faculty organizations.

8. After the steering committee submits alternative proposals, the full committee will hold hearing(s) to which all interested parties will be invited to testify on the alternative proposals.

9. The full committee will independently pursue the issue of collective bargaining for four-year institutions. The four-year Council of Presidents and the respective faculty organizations will be requested to submit policy statements with regard to collective bargaining.

COST:

Estimated Senate Costs:		$3,150
Full Committee Meeting (assuming no special meetings necessary)		$ 0
Steering Committee (three meetings, 5 members at $40 @)		
per diem	$600	
travel	450	$1,500
Advisory Committee * (five meetings)		
travel		$1,000
other expenses		300
Printing, copying, misc.		350
		$3,150

* This cost estimate assumes that advisory committee members' travel expenses, other than for the chairman and staff, would be absorbed by the agencies they represent.

Meeting locations, whenever feasible, would be held at other than a commercial facility.

APPENDIX C

COMMUNITY COLLEGE COLLECTIVE BARGAINING STUDY
(SFR 74-271)

STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

Senator Gordon Sandison - Higher Education Committee - Chairman

Senator Gary Grant - - - Labor Committee

Senator Sam Guess - - - - Higher Education Committee

Senator Dan Marsh - - - - Higher Education Committee

Senator Jim Matson - - - Labor Committee

Staff:

Jim Bricker, Staff Director - Senate Research Center

Marilyn Hammond - - - - - - - Senate Minority Caucus

Carolyn McCalden - - - - - - Senate Higher Education Committee

Jeff Riddle - - - - - - - - - Senate Labor Committee

ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

John Petrich - - - Tacoma - Co-Chairman

John Ryder - - - - Seattle - Co-Chairman

Representing

Pinckney Rohrback - Trustees' Association (Shoreline Community College)

Joe Malik - - - - - Presidents' Association (Grays Harbor Community College)

Dave Karber - - - - Departmental Chairman (Everett Community College)

Lloyd Frissell - - Fulltime Faculty Representative (North Seattle Community College)

Edith Clarke - - - Parttime Faculty Representative (Bellevue Community College)

Karen Higgins - - - Students' Representative (Green River Community College)

John Terrey - - - - State Board for Community College Education

APPENDIX D

STATE OF WASHINGTON

SENATE RESEARCH CENTER

J. ARNOLD BRICKER, *Staff Director*

MEMORANDUM

DATE: January 3, 1975

TO: Members, Advisory Committee on Community College Collective Bargaining

FROM: Jeff Riddle, Research Analyst

SUBJECT: Subjects of Bargaining Under NLRA

MANDATORY SUBJECTS OF BARGAINING

The National Labor Relations Act compels bargaining with respect to wages, hours and other terms and conditions of employment.

The language "rates of pay, wages, hours and other terms and conditions of employment" fixes not only the subjects about which the employer and the union are compelled by law to bargain, but also the field in which (1) the employer is barred from unilateral action and (2) the employee is excluded from making his own individual agreement with the employer unless the union waives in whole or in part its right to preempt all unilateral action or individual bargaining with respect to this subject matter.

While the term "wages and hours" does not seem to require any elaboration, it is necessary to determine how broadly or narrowly the National Labor Relations Board and the courts have defined wages and hours, as well as other terms and conditions of employment.

Wages -- some obvious examples of mandatory subjects falling under the heading of wages are hourly rates of pay, incentive plan, overtime pay and shift differentials, as well as paid holidays, paid vacations and severance pay.

Some less obvious examples are Christmas bonuses, pension and other welfare plans, profit sharing plans, stock purchase plans, merit wage increases and company houses, meals, discounts and services.

Hours -- Hours of employment have caused little difficulty.

Other Terms and Conditions of Employment -- Numerous topics fall within "other terms and conditions of employment" as this phrase is used in the National Labor Relations Act. There are many obvious examples of mandatory subjects for bargaining. Among these are the following:

LEGISLATIVE BUILDING OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON 98504 TELEPHONE: (206) 753-6826

Provisions for grievance procedure and arbitration, layoffs, discharge, workloads, vacations, holidays, sick leave, work rules, use of bulletin boards by union, change of payment from a salary base to an hourly base, definition of bargaining unit work and performance of bargaining unit work by supervisors. Some less obvious examples are seniority promotions and transfers, compulsory retirement age, union shop check off, agency shop and hiring hall, management rights clauses, plant rules, safety, no strike clause, partial closure of business and plant relocation, and arrangements for negotiation.

PERMISSIVE SUBJECTS

There are some subjects that are not mandatorily bargainable which fall outside the phrase "wages, hours and other terms and conditions of employment" which the law permits bargaining on.

The National Labor Relations Board has defined a series of matters which are permissible subjects of bargaining. These include supervisors and agricultural labor, parties to collective bargaining agreement, performance bonds, legal-liability clauses, internal union affairs, union label, industry promotion funds and settlement of unfair labor practice charges.

Further elaboration on the scope of bargaining under the National Labor Relations Act can be found in Chapters 14, 15 and 16 of the Developing Labor Law which is edited by Charles J. Morris. The above is a condensation of those chapters.

JR:gs

APPENDIX E_1

STATE OF WASHINGTON

SENATE RESEARCH CENTER

J. ARNOLD BRICKER, *Staff Director*

COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACULTY BARGAINING QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Please check the best identification of your position

___Trustee ___President

___Full-time faculty ___Administrator

___Part-time faculty ___Department or Division Chairman

___Student

2. Do you believe that a bargaining bill should include part-time faculty in the bargaining unit?

___Yes

___No

3. Do you believe that department/division chairmen should be in the bargaining unit?

___Yes

___No

4. Do you believe that administrators--other than the president-- should be empowered to bargain independently?

___Yes

___No

5. Do you believe that students should be included in the bargaining process?

___Yes

___No

6. Do you favor negotiations at the local level or the state level?

___Local

___State

7. Do you believe that there should be a statewide salary schedule for community college faculty?

___Yes

___No

8. Do you believe that collective bargaining for community college faculty should be limited to the traditional economic issues such as wages and hours?

___Yes

___No

LEGISLATIVE BUILDING OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON 98504 TELEPHONE: (206) 753-6826

9. Which of these alternatives best represents your position: (check one)

___Oppose collective bargaining in the community colleges

___Support modification of the PN Law

___Support a comprehensive bargaining bill for all education--K-12, C.C. and four-year institutions

___Support a community college collective bargaining bill

___Support a higher education bill--community colleges and four-year institutions

___Support a state public employees collective bargaining bill to include community colleges

10. Do you believe that the major decision making on your campus should be made by:

___Collective bargaining

___Internal governance

___Both

APPENDIX E_2

. QUESTIONNAIRE SUMMARY

COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACULTY COLLECTIVE BARGAINING QUESTIONNAIRE

DISTRIBUTION Approximately 6,500 questionnaires were distributed to trustees, presidents, full-time faculty, part-time faculty, and administrators in the community college system. Questionnaires were also distributed to the Council of Representatives and Presidents (CORP) and a few additional students.

Questionnaires were distributed in accordance with a color code. Canary forms were sent to schools in Northwest Washington, green tint forms to Southwest Washington, green to Eastern Washington, and buff to the Puget Sound area.

RETURNS 71.8 percent of the trustees, 86.7 percent of the presidents, and 76.9 percent of the students have responded to the questionnaire. Of the approximately 2,400 full-time faculty, more than 55 percent have responded, and of the nearly 3,400 part-time faculty, more than 17 percent have responded. 87 percent of the administrators* (including department chairmen/division chairmen**) have responded. The total response for all positions is 37.9 percent.

Responses are summarized into five different sets: one for each color and one set which includes all responses.

The no response category was a "catch all" for all responses which did not fit the choices provided.

*Administrators are considered non-classified personnel who perform administrative functions at least 50% of the time.
**On some campuses department chairmen/division chairmen are considered administrators, on others, full-time faculty.

SRC: 1/8/75

DISTRIBUTION/RETURNS

CANARY:

Peninsula College, Port Angeles
Whatcom Community College, Bellingham
Skagit Valley College, Mt. Vernon
Olympic College, Bremerton

GREEN TINT:

Lower Columbia College, Longview
Clark College, Vancouver
Centralia College
Olympia Vocational Technical Institute
District XII, Centralia
Grays Harbor College, Aberdeen

GREEN:

Yakima Valley College
Wenatchee Valley College
Big Bend Community College, Moses Lake
Spokane Community College
Spokane Falls Community College
District XVII, Spokane
Columbia Basin Community College, Pasco
Walla Walla Community College

BUFF:

Bellevue Community College
Shoreline Community College, Seattle
Seattle Central
Seattle North
Seattle South
District VI, Seattle
Edmonds Community College, Lynnwood
Everett Community College
District V, Everett
Green River Community College, Auburn
Highline Community College, Midway
Ft. Steilacoom Community College, Tacoma
Tacoma Community College

SUMMARY OF DISTRIBUTION/RETURNS

	APPROXIMATE NUMBER DISTRIBUTED	NUMBER RETURNED	PERCENT RETURNED
Trustees	110	79	71.8%
Presidents	30	26	86.7
Students	39	31	79.5
Full-Time Faculty	2,393	1,322	55.2
Part-Time Faculty	3,395	589	17.3
Administrators/ Division Chairmen	447	390	87.2
TOTAL	6,414	2,437	38.0%

SRC:1/8/75

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

2. DO YOU BELIEVE THAT A BARGAINING BILL SHOULD INCLUDE PART-TIME FACULTY IN THE BARGAINING UNIT?

	Percentage of "yes" responses
Students	93.3
Part-time faculty	81.9
Full-time faculty	71.1
Division Chairmen	62.7
Administrators	52.9
Trustees	49.4
Presidents	38.5
Total	70.6

70.6 percent of all responses were in favor of the inclusion of part-time faculty in the bargaining unit.

81.9 percent of the part-time faculty responded that they should be included.

71.1 percent of the full-time faculty, 93.3 percent of the students, 52.9 percent of the administrators, and 62.7 percent of the department/division chairmen noted that part-time faculty should be included.

61.5 percent of the presidents responded that they should not be included. The trustees responded 49.4 percent for inclusion and 48.1 percent against.

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES IN FAVOR OF THE INCLUSION OF PART-TIME FACULTY IN THE BARGAINING UNIT

	Southwest (green tint)	Puget Sound (buff)	Eastern Wn. (green)	Northwest (canary)
Students	100.0	94.1	100.0	75.0
Part-time faculty	76.7	89.8	62.2	87.1
Full-time faculty	64.3	77.6	62.4	78.2
Division chairmen	60.9	68.7	44.1	90.0
Administrators	32.4	62.3	30.0	76.9
Trustees	53.0	57.1	36.8	46.7
Presidents	25.0	50.0	28.6	33.3
	62.9	78.3	57.7	78.2

57.7 percent of the responses from Eastern Washington favored inclusion with only 62 percent of the part-time faculty, 44.1 percent of the department/division chairmen, and 30 percent of the administrators in favor of inclusion of part-time faculty in the bargaining unit.

In Southwest Washington, only 32.4 percent of the administrators were in favor of part-time faculty inclusion, whereas 60.9 percent of the department/division chairmen were.

3. DO YOU BELIEVE THAT DEPARTMENT/DIVISION CHAIRMEN SHOULD BE IN THE BARGAINING UNIT?

	Percentage of "yes" responses
Division Chairmen	84.3
Full-time faculty	74.1
Students	70.0
Part-time faculty	70.5
Administrators	59.6
Trustees	29.1
Presidents	26.9
Total	70.2

84.3 percent of the department or division chairmen responding were in favor of their inclusion in the bargaining unit. 70.2 percent of all responses were in favor of their inclusion with 74.1 percent of the full-time faculty, 70.5 percent of the part-time faculty, 70.0 percent of the students, and 59.6 percent of the administrators also favoring their inclusion. 69.2 percent of the presidents and 64.6 percent of the trustees responded that they should not be in the bargaining unit.

PERCENTAGE RESPONDING THAT DEPARTMENT/DIVISION CHAIRMEN SHOULD BE IN THE BARGAINING UNIT

	Southwest (green tint)	Puget Sound (buff)	Eastern Wn. (green)	Northwest (canary)
Division chairmen	100.0	80.6	76.5	100.0
Full-time faculty	84.1	72.9	71.3	81.8
Students	80.0	58.8	100.0	75.0
Part-time faculty	67.1	74.8	59.1	75.8
Administrators	70.6	54.9	61.7	61.5
Trustees	41.2	14.3	42.1	26.7
Presidents	25.0	25.0	42.9	0
	76.7	70.1	67.5	70.7

4. DO YOU BELIEVE THAT ADMINISTRATORS--OTHER THAN THE PRESIDENT--SHOULD BE EMPOWERED TO BARGAIN INDEPENDENTLY?

	Percentage of "yes" responses
Administrators	74.9
Presidents	65.4
Trustees	48.1
Division Chairmen	50.7
Full-time faculty	37.8
Part-time faculty	36.3
Students	26.7
Total	42.5

Overall, 52.2 percent of the responses were against the idea that administrators should be empowered to bargain independently. However, 74.9 percent of the administrators and 65.4 percent of the presidents believed they should be. The trustees and division chairmen were split, both nearly 50 percent for and 50 percent against. Full-time (56.5 percent) and part-time (56.9 percent) faculty and students (70.0 percent) did not think administrators should be empowered to bargain independently.

PERCENT OF RESPONSES FAVORING THE IDEA THAT ADMINISTRATORS SHOULD BE IN THE BARGAINING UNIT

	Southwest (green tint)	Puget Sound (buff)	Eastern Wn. (green)	Northwest (canary)
Administrators	76.5	68.9	78.3	87.2
Presidents	50.0	66.7	71.4	66.7
Trustees	35.3	35.7	57.9	73.3
Division chairmen	39.1	55.2	47.1	60.0
Full-time faculty	36.3	37.9	36.0	54.5
Part-time faculty	35.6	37.2	32.3	40.3
Students	20.0	35.3	0	25.0
	40.6	41.9	40.4	58.0

58 percent of the responses from Northwest Washington were in favor of administrators bargaining independently. Every position responded more favorably than the overall percentages of "yes responses".

5. DO YOU BELIEVE THAT STUDENTS SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN THE BARGAINING PROCESS?

	Percentage of "yes" responses
Students	86.7
Presidents	26.9
Administrators	23.1
Part-time faculty	22.8
Full-time faculty	19.1
Division Chairmen	15.7
Trustees	10.1
Total	20.9

77 percent of all responses were against the inclusion of students in the bargaining process. 86.7 percent of all students were in favor of their inclusion.

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES FAVORING THE INCLUSION OF STUDENTS IN THE BARGAINING PROCESS

	Southwest (green tint)	Puget Sound (buff)	Eastern Wn. (green)	Northwest (canary)
Students	80.0	82.4	100.0	100.0
Presidents	25.0	41.7	14.3	0
Administrators	20.6	18.9	25.0	35.9
Part-time faculty	15.1	26.8	17.3	22.6
Full-time faculty	21.0	21.1	15.0	21.8
Division chairmen	30.4	11.9	17.6	0
Trustees	0	17.9	5.3	13.3
	20.1	22.8	16.6	24.5

6. DO YOU FAVOR NEGOTIATIONS AT THE LOCAL LEVEL OR THE STATE LEVEL?

	Percentage of "local" responses
Students	86.7
Trustees	77.2
Full-time faculty	68.4
Division Chairmen	52.3
Administrators	63.9
Presidents	53.8
Part-time faculty	52.3
Total	64.3

64.3 percent of all responses were in favor of negotiations at the local level. The students (86.7 percent) and the trustees (77.2 percent) were strongly in favor but faculty, especially part-time faculty (52.3 percent), presidents (53.8 percent), administrators (63.9 percent), and division chairmen (52.3 percent) were not so definite in their response.

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES FAVORING NEGOTIATIONS AT LOCAL LEVEL

	Southwest (green tint)	Puget Sound (buff)	Eastern Wn. (green)	Northwest (canary)
Students	100.0	94.1	75.0	75.0
Trustees	76.5	82.1	57.9	93.3
Full-time faculty	63.1	83.0	50.2	43.6
Division chairmen	65.2	77.6	55.9	50.0
Administrators	67.6	69.7	53.3	59.0
Presidents	50.0	66.7	28.6	66.7
Part-time faculty	60.3	56.0	36.2	56.5
	64.2	74.4	48.3	56.4

The Puget Sound area was 74.4 percent in favor of local negotiations. Northwest Washington was 56.4 percent in favor of local negotiations but with almost 55 percent of the full-time faculty favoring state negotiations. Eastern Washington responses were 48.3 percent for local negotiations and 47.0 percent for state negotiations. 56.7 percent of the part-time faculty favored state negotiations as well as 71.4 percent of the presidents.

7. DO YOU BELIEVE THAT THERE SHOULD BE A STATEWIDE SALARY SCHEDULE FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACULTY?

	Percentage of "yes" responses
Presidents	65.4
Part-time faculty	65.1
Administrators	44.3
Trustees	41.8
Full-time faculty	41.4
Division Chairmen	34.3
Students	30.0
Total	47.1

47.1 percent of the responses were for such a schedule. 50.2 percent were against. The trustees (58.2 percent), full-time faculty (56 percent), students (66.7 percent), administrators (54.1 percent), and division chairmen (60.4 percent) believe that there should not be a statewide salary schedule. 65 percent of the part-time faculty and 65.4 percent of the presidents responded in favor of such a schedule.

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES IN FAVOR OF STATEWIDE SALARY SCHEDULE

	Southwest (green tint)	Puget Sound (buff)	Eastern Wn. (green)	Northwest (canary)
Presidents	50.0	50.0	100.0	66.7
Part-time faculty	68.5	58.5	77.2	71.0
Administrators	35.3	34.4	63.3	53.8
Trustees	35.3	32.1	63.2	40.0
Full-time faculty	53.5	23.2	61.4	74.5
Division chairmen	39.1	22.4	47.1	60.0
Students	40.0	17.6	75.0	25.0
	52.7	33.8	64.4	64.4

In Southwest Washington the full-time faculty (53.5 percent), as well as the part-time faculty and presidents, were also in favor of a schedule; 52.7 percent of all their responses were in favor of a schedule.

In the Puget Sound area, 63.9 percent of the responses did not believe there should be a schedule. The part-time faculty (58.5 percent) were the only group responding positively. 50 percent of the presidents responded yes and 50 percent no.

64.4 percent of the responses from Northwest Washington were in favor of a schedule. The trustees and students were the only two groups which did not respond more than 50 percent of the time in favor of a schedule.

64.4 percent of the Eastern Washington responses also were in favor of a statewide salary schedule. 77.2 percent of the part-time faculty were in favor.

8. DO YOU BELIEVE THAT COLLECTIVE BARGAINING FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACULTY SHOULD BE LIMITED TO THE TRADITIONAL ECONOMIC ISSUES SUCH AS WAGES AND HOURS?

	Percentage of "yes" responses
Presidents	92.3
Trustees	68.4
Administrators	56.5
Part-time faculty	25.7
Division Chairmen	22.4
Students	16.7
Full-time faculty	11.2
Total	22.8

75.3 percent of all responses were against the idea of limiting collective bargaining to the traditional economic issues. 87.3 percent of the full-time faculty, 71.7 percent of the part-time faculty, 80.0 percent of the students and 75.4 percent of the division chairmen did not believe that collective bargaining should be limited. However, 68.4 percent of the trustees, 92.3 percent of the presidents, and 56.5 percent of the administrators did believe that collective bargaining should be limited.

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES IN FAVOR OF LIMITING COLLECTIVE BARGAINING TO THE TRADITIONAL ECONOMIC ISSUES

	Southwest (green tint)	Puget Sound (buff)	Eastern Wn. (green)	Northwest (canary)
Presidents	75.0	91.7	100.0	100.0
Trustees	70.6	64.3	68.4	73.3
Administrators	50.0	62.3	50.0	53.8
Part-time faculty	32.9	22.5	35.4	14.5
Division chairmen	17.4	20.9	32.3	10.0
Students	0	17.6	0	50.0
Full-time faculty	8.9	8.8	15.4	12.7
	23.6	20.4	25.3	28.7

9. VEHICLE FOR COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

For each position, the category receiving the largest percentage of responses was "support a community college collective bargaining bill." The trustees (25.3 percent) were in opposition to collective bargaining in the community colleges as a second choice. Full-time faculty, students, presidents, and administrators were in support of a higher education bill which would include community college and four-year institutions as their second choice. Part-time faculty were 18.7 percent in favor of a bill including both community college and four-year institutions. However, 23.2 percent of their responses were in support of a community college bill for education, K through 12, community college, and four-year institutions.

10. DO YOU BELIEVE THAT MAJOR DECISION MAKING ON YOUR CAMPUS SHOULD BE MADE BY COLLECTIVE BARGAINING, INTERNAL GOVERNANCE, OR BOTH?

54.3 percent of the responses were in favor of both collective bargaining and internal governance. 67.1 percent of the trustees favored internal governance, and 19 percent of the trustees favored both. 57.4 percent of the full-time faculty favored both, and 24.1 percent favored collective bargaining. Also of the part-time faculty, 53.8 percent favored both and, secondly, 21.8 percent favored collective bargaining. None of the presidents favored collective bargaining. 57.7 percent responded in favor of internal governance with 34.6 percent responding for both. Administrators responded with 43.5 percent for internal governance and 43.5 percent for both. Department or division chairmen responded with 68.7 percent for both internal governance and collective bargaining, 13.4 percent for internal governance and 11.9 percent for collective bargaining.

"TOTAL" RESPONSES

2. DO YOU BELIEVE THAT A BARGAINING BILL SHOULD INCLUDE PART-TIME FACULTY IN THE BARGAINING UNIT?

TOTAL RESPONSES		% YES	% NO	% NO RESPONSES
79	Trustee	49.4 (39)	48.1 (38)	2.5 (2)
1318	Full-time faculty	71.1 (937)	26.8 (353)	2.1 (28)
587	Part-time faculty	81.9 (481)	17.0 (100)	1.0 (6)
30	Student	93.3 (28)	6.7 (2)	------
26	President	38.5 (10)	61.5 (16)	------
255	Administrator	52.9 (135)	45.9 (117)	1.2 (3)
134	Dept. or Div. Chairman	62.7 (84)	34.3 (46)	3.0 (4)
2429	TOTAL	70.6 (1714)	27.7 (672)	1.8 (43)

3. DO YOU BELIEVE THAT DEPARTMENT/DIVISION CHAIRMEN SHOULD BE IN THE BARGAINING UNIT?

TOTAL RESPONSES		YES	NO	NO RESPONSES
79	Trustee	29.1 (23)	64.6 (51)	6.3 (5)
1318	Full-time faculty	74.1 (976)	22.7 (299)	3.3 (43)
587	Part-time faculty	70.5 (414)	25.7 (151)	3.7 (22)
30	Student	70.0 (21)	23.3 (7)	6.6 (2)
26	President	26.9 (7)	69.2 (18)	3.8 (1)
255	Administrator	59.6 (152)	38.0 (97)	2.4 (6)
134	Dept. or Div. Chairman	84.3 (113)	13.4 (18)	2.2 (3)
2429	TOTAL	70.2 (1706)	26.4 (641)	3.4 (82)

4. DO YOU BELIEVE THAT ADMINISTRATORS--OTHER THAN THE PRESIDENT--SHOULD BE EMPOWERED TO BARGAIN INDEPENDENTLY?

TOTAL RESPONSES		YES	NO	NO RESPONSES
79	Trustee	48.1 (38)	49.4 (39)	2.5 (2)
1318	Full-time faculty	37.8 (498)	56.5 (745)	5.7 (75)
587	Part-time faculty	36.3 (213)	56.9 (334)	6.8 (40)
30	Student	26.7 (8)	70.0 (21)	3.3 (1)
26	President	65.4 (17)	34.6 (9)	-------
255	Administrator	74.9 (191)	23.5 (60)	1.6 (4)
134	Dept. or Div. Chairman	50.7 (68)	44.8 (60)	4.5 (6)
2429	TOTAL	42.5 (1033)	52.2 (1268)	5.3 (128)

"TOTAL RESPONSES"

5. DO YOU BELIEVE THAT STUDENTS SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN THE BARGAINING PROCESS?

TOTAL RESPONSES		% YES	% NO	% NO RESPONSES
79	Trustee	10.1 (8)	88.6 (70)	1.3 (1)
1318	Full-time faculty	19.1 (252)	78.5 (1035)	2.4 (31)
587	Part-time faculty	22.8 (134)	75.5 (443)	1.7 (10)
30	Student	86.7 (26)	13.3 (4)	------
26	President	26.9 (7)	73.1 (19)	------
255	Administrator	23.1 (59)	75.3 (192)	1.6 (4)
134	Dept. or Div. Chairman	15.7 (21)	80.6 (108)	3.7 (5)
2429	TOTAL	20.9 (507)	77.0 (1871)	2.1 (51)

6. DO YOU FAVOR NEGOTIATIONS AT THE LOCAL LEVEL OR THE STATE LEVEL?

TOTAL RESPONSES		% LOCAL	% STATE	% NO RESPONSES
79	Trustee	77.2 (61)	21.5 (17)	1.3 (1)
1318	Full-time faculty	68.4 (901)	28.0 (369)	3.6 (48)
587	Part-time faculty	52.3 (307)	41.7 (245)	6.0 (35)
30	Student	86.7 (26)	13.3 (4)	------
26	President	53.8 (14)	38.5 (10)	7.7 (2)
255	Administrator	63.9 (163)	33.7 (86)	2.4 (6)
134	Dept. or Div. Chairman	67.9 (91)	27.6 (37)	4.5 (6)
2429	TOTAL	64.3 (1563)	31.6 (768)	4.0 (98)

7. DO YOU BELIEVE THAT THERE SHOULD BE A STATEWIDE SALARY SCHEDULE FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACULTY?

TOTAL RESPONSES		% YES	% NO	% NO RESPONSES
79	Trustee	41.8 (33)	58.2 (46)	------
1318	Full-time faculty	41.4 (545)	56.0 (738)	2.7 (35)
587	Part-time faculty	65.1 (382)	31.8 (187)	3.1 (18)
30	Student	30.0 (9)	66.7 (20)	3.3 (1)
26	President	65.4 (17)	34.6 (9)	------
255	Administrator	44.3 (113)	54.1 (138)	1.6 (4)
134	Dept. or Div. Chairman	34.4 (46)	60.4 (81)	5.2 (7)
2429	TOTAL	47.1 (1145)	50.2 (1219)	2.7 (65)

"TOTAL" RESPONSES

8. DO YOU BELIEVE THAT COLLECTIVE BARGAINING FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACULTY SHOULD BE LIMITED TO THE TRADITIONAL ECONOMIC ISSUES SUCH AS WAGES AND HOURS?

TOTAL RESPONSES		% YES	% NO	% NO RESPONSES
79	Trustee	68.4 (54)	24.1 (19)	7.6 (6)
1318	Full-time faculty	11.2 (147)	87.3 (1151)	1.5 (20)
587	Part-time faculty	25.7 (151	71.7 (421)	2.6 (15)
30	Student	16.7 (5)	80.0 (24)	3.3 (1)
26	President	92.3 (24)	7.7 (2)	------
255	Administrator	56.5 (144)	43.1 (110)	0.4 (1)
134	Dept. or Div. Chairman	22.4 (30)	75.4 (101)	2.2 (3)
2429	TOTAL	22.8 (555)	75.3 (1828)	1.9 (46)

9. WHICH OF THESE ALTERNATIVES BEST REPRESENT YOUR POSITION:

TOTAL RESPONSES		"TOTAL" RESPONSES						
		OPPOSE COLL. BARG. IN COMM.COLLEGES	SUPPORT MODIFICATION OF PN LAW	SUPPORT A COMP. BARG.BILL FOR ED.--K-12, CC. & 4-YR. INSTIT.	SUPPORT COMM. COLLEGE COLL. BARG. BILL	SUPPORT HIER ED.BILL-COMM COLL.&4-YEAR INSTITUTIONS	SUPPORT ST. PUBLIC EMP.COLL.BARG.BILL TO INCLUDE COM.COLL	NO RESPONSE
79	Trustee	25.3 (20)	13.9 (11)	1.3 (1)	34.2 (27)	13.9 (11)	2.5 (2)	8.9 (7)
1318	Full-time faculty	2.4 (32)	2.6 (34)	16.5 (217)	36.3 (479)	21.5 (283)	8.6 (114)	12.1 (159)
587	Part-time faculty	6.5 (38)	3.1 (18)	23.2 (136)	26.9 (158)	18.7 (110)	10.1 (59)	11.6 (68)
30	Student	--------	3.3 (1)	--------	70.0 (21)	16.7 (5)	6.7 (2)	3.3 (1)
26	President	7.7 (2)	26.9 (7)	3.8 (1)	30.8 (8)	23.1 (6)	--------	7.7 (2)
255	Administrator	8.2 (21)	7.5 (19)	9.8 (25)	33.7 (86)	22.0 (56)	7.5 (19)	11.4 (29)
134	Dept. or Div. Chairman	3.0 (4)	3.7 (5)	10.4 (14)	39.6 (53)	21.6 (29)	11.2 (15)	10.4 (14)
2429	TOTAL	4.8 (117)	3.9 (95)	16.2 (394)	34.3 (832)	20.6 (500)	8.7 (211)	11.5 (280)

10. DO YOU BELIEVE THAT THE MAJOR DECISION MAKING ON YOUR CAMPUS SHOULD BE MADE BY:

TOTAL RESPONSES		COLLECTIVE BARGAINING	INTERNAL GOVERNANCE	BOTH	NO RESPONSE
79	Trustee	3.8 (3)	67.1 (53)	19.0 (15)	10.1 (8)
1318	Full-time faculty	24.1 (318)	9.3 (122)	57.4 (757)	9.2 (121)
587	Part-time faculty	21.8 (128)	16.0 (94)	53.8 (316)	8.3 (49)
30	Student	20.0 (6)	16.7 (5)	63.3 (19)	------
26	President	-------	57.7 (15)	34.6 (9)	7.7 (2)
255	Administrator	5.1 (13)	43.5 (111)	43.5 (111)	7.8 (20)
134	Dept. or Div. Chairman	11.9 (16)	13.4 (18)	68.7 (92)	6.0 (8)
2429	TOTAL	19.9 (484)	17.2 (418)	54.3 (1319)	8.6 (208)

"GREEN TINT" RESPONSES

2. DO YOU BELIEVE THAT A BARGAINING BILL SHOULD INCLUDE PART-TIME FACULTY IN THE BARGAINING UNIT?

TOTAL RESPONSES		YES	NO	NO RESPONSES
17	Trustee	53.0	41.2 (7)	5.9(1)
157	Full-time faculty	64.3 (101)	33.8(53)	1.9(3)
73	Part-time faculty	76.7 (56)	21.9 (15)	1.4 (1)
5	Student	100.0 (5)	---	---
4	President	25.0 (1)	75.0 (3)	----
34	Administrator	32.4 (11)	67.6 (23)	---
23	Dept. or Div. Chairman	60.9 (14)	30.4 (7)	8.7 (2)
313	TOTAL	62.9 (197)	34.8 (109)	2.2 (7)

3. DO YOU BELIEVE THAT DEPARTMENT/DIVISION CHAIRMEN SHOULD BE IN THE BARGAINING UNIT?

TOTAL RESPONSES		YES	NO	NO RESPONSES
17	Trustee	41.2 (7)	58.8 (10)	----
157	Full-time faculty	84.1 (132)	13.4 (21)	02.5 (4)
73	Part-time faculty	67.1 (49)	28.8 (21)	04.1 (3)
5	Student	80.0 (4)	20.0 (1)	---
4	President	25.0 (1)	50.0 (2)	25.0 (1)
34	Administrator	70.6 (24)	26.5 (9)	2.9 (1)
23	Dept. or Div. Chairman	100.0 (23)	----	----
313	TOTAL	76.7 (240)	20.4 (64)	2.9 (9)

4. DO YOU BELIEVE THAT ADMINISTRATORS--OTHER THAN THE PRESIDENT--SHOULD BE EMPOWERED TO BARGAIN INDEPENDENTLY?

TOTAL RESPONSES		YES	NO	NO RESPONSES
17	Trustee	35.3 (6)	64.7 (11)	---
157	Full-time faculty	36.3(57)	57.3 (90)	6.4 (10)
73	Part-time faculty	35.6 (26)	57.5 (42)	6.8 (5)
5	Student	20.0 (1)	80.0 (4)	---
4	President	50.0 (2)	50.0 (2)	---
34	Administrator	76.5 (26)	23.5 (8)	---
23	Dept. or Div. Chairman	39.1 (9)	52.2 (12)	8.7 (2)
313	TOTAL	40.6 (127)	54.0 (169)	5.4 (17)

5. DO YOU BELIEVE THAT STUDENTS SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN THE BARGAINING PROCESS?

TOTAL RESPONSES		YES	NO	NO RESPONSES
17	Trustee	---	100.0 (17)	---
157	Full-time faculty	21.0 (33)	77.7 (122)	1.3 (2)
73	Part-time faculty	15.1 (11)	83.6 (61)	1.4 (1)
5	Student	80.0 (4)	20.0 (1)	---
4	President	25.0 (1)	75.0 (3)	---
34	Administrator	20.6 (7)	79.4 (27)	---
23	Dept. or Div. Chairman	30.4 (7)	65.2 (15)	4.3 (1)
313	TOTAL	20.1 (63)	78.6 (246)	1.3 (4)

6. DO YOU FAVOR NEGOTIATIONS AT THE LOCAL LEVEL OR THE STATE LEVEL?

TOTAL RESPONSES		LOCAL	STATE	NO RESPONSES
17	Trustee	76.5 (13)	17.6 (3)	5.9 (1)
157	Full-time faculty	63.1 (99)	33.8 (53)	3.2 (5)
73	Part-time faculty	60.3 (44)	37.0 (27)	2.7 (2)
5	Student	100.0 (5)	---	---
4	President	50.0 (2)	25.0 (1)	25.0 (1)
34	Administrator	67.6 (23)	29.4 (10)	2.9 (1)
23	Dept. or Div. Chairman	65.2 (15)	21.7 (5)	13.0 (3)
288	TOTAL	64.2 (201)	31.6 (99)	4.2 (13)

7. DO YOU BELIEVE THAT THERE SHOULD BE A STATEWIDE SALARY SCHEDULE FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACULTY?

TOTAL RESPONSES	RESPONSES TALLIED		YES	NO	NO RESPONSES
17		Trustee	35.3 (6)	64.7 (11)	
157		Full-time faculty	53.5 (84)	43.9 (69)	2.5 (4)
73		Part-time faculty	68.5 (50)	30.1 (22)	1.4 (1)
5		Student	40.0 (2)	60.0 (3)	---
4		President	50.0 (2)	50.0 (2)	---
34		Administrator	35.3 (12)	55.9 (19)	8.8 (3)
23		Dept. or Div. Chairman	39.1 (9)	47.8 (11)	13.0 (3)
313		TOTAL	52.7 (165)	43.8 (137)	3.5 (11)

8. DO YOU BELIEVE THAT COLLECTIVE BARGAINING FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACULTY SHOULD BE LIMITED TO THE TRADITIONAL ECONOMIC ISSUES SUCH AS WAGES AND HOURS?

TOTAL RESPONSES		YES	NO	NO RESPONSES
17	Trustee	70.6 (12)	29.4 (5)	---
157	Full-time faculty	8.9 (14)	87.9 (138)	3.2 (5)
73	Part-time faculty	32.9 (24)	64.4 (47)	2.7 (2)
5	Student	---	100.0 (5)	---
4	President	75.0 (3)	25.0 (1)	---
34	Administrator	50.0 (17)	47.1 (16)	2.9 (1)
23	Dept. or Div. Chairman	17.4 (4)	78.3 (18)	4.3 (1)
313	TOTAL	23.6 (74)	73.5 (230)	2.9 (9)

9. WHICH OF THESE ALTERNATIVES BEST REPRESENT YOUR POSITION:

TOTAL RESPONSES		OPPOSE COLL. BARG. IN COMM.COLLEGES	SUPPORT MODIFICATION OF PN LAW	SUPPORT A COMP. BARG.BILL FOR ED.--K-12, CC. & 4-YR. INSTIT.	SUPPORT COMM. COLLEGE COLL. BARG. BILL	SUPPORT HIER ED.BILL-COMM COLL.&4-YEAR INSTITUTIONS	SUPPORT ST. PUBLIC EMP.COLL.BARG.BILL TO INCLUDE COM.COLL	NO RESPONSE
		"GREEN TINT" RESPONSES						
17	Trustee	5.9 (1)	23.5 (4)	---	41.2 (7)	11.8 (2)	5.9 (1)	11.8 (2)
157	Full-time faculty	1.3 (2)	1.9 (3)	16.6 (26)	35.7 (56)	17.2 (27)	10.8 (17)	16.6 (26)
73	Part-time faculty	6.8 (5)	1.4 (1)	27.4 (20)	20.5 (15)	15.1 (11)	17.8 (13)	11.0 (8)
5	Student	---	----	---	80.0 (4)	---	---	20.0 (1)
4	President	---	25.0 (1)	===	---	25.0 (1)	---	50.0 (2)
34	Administrator	8.8 (3)	8.8 (3)	5.9 (2)	23.5 (8)	32.4 (11)	5.9 (2)	15.2 (5)
23	Dept. or Div. Chairman	12.5 (2)	12.5 (2)	12.5 (3)	37.5 (8)	6.3 (3)	18.8 (4)	--- (1)
313	TOTAL	3.5 (13)	4.9 (14)	15.3 (51)	33.3 (98)	17.0 (55)	11.5 (37)	14.6 (45)

10. DO YOU BELIEVE THAT THE MAJOR DECISION MAKING ON YOUR CAMPUS SHOULD BE MADE BY:

TOTAL RESPONSES		COLLECTIVE BARGAINING	INTERNAL GOVERNANCE	BOTH	NO RESPONSE
17	Trustee	---	64.7 (11)	23.5 (11)	11.8 (2)
157	Full-time faculty	19.7 (31)	7.0 (11)	65.0 (102)	8.2 (13
73	Part-time faculty	23.3 (17)	17.8 (13)	49.3 (36)	9.6 (7)
5	Student	20.0 (1)	---	80.0 (4)	---
4	President	---	25.0 (1)	50.0 (2)	25.0 (1)
34	Administrator	5.9 (2)	47.1 (16)	35.3 (12)	11.8 (4)
23	Dept. or Div. Chairman	8.7 (2)	13.0 (3)	69.6 (16)	8.7 (2)
313	TOTAL	16.9 (53)	17.6 (55)	56.2 (176)	9.3 (29)

"BUFF" RESPONSES

2. DO YOU BELIEVE THAT A BARGAINING BILL SHOULD INCLUDE PART-TIME FACULTY IN THE BARGAINING UNIT?

TOTAL RESPONSES		% YES	% NO	% NO RESPONSES
28	Trustee	57.1 (16)	42.9 (12)	-------
678	Full-time faculty	77.6 (526)	20.4 (138)	2.1 (14)
325	Part-time faculty	89.8 (292)	8.9 (29)	1.2 (4)
17	Student	94.1 (16)	5.9 (1)	-------
12	President	50.0 (6)	50.0 (6)	-------
122	Administrator	62.3 (76)	36.9 (45)	0.8 (1)
67	Dept. or Div. Chairman	68.7 (46)	31.3 (21)	-------
1249	TOTAL	78.3 (978)	20.2 (252)	1.5 (19)

3. DO YOU BELIEVE THAT DEPARTMENT/DIVISION CHAIRMEN SHOULD BE IN THE BARGAINING UNIT?

TOTAL RESPONSES		YES	NO	NO RESPONSES
28	Trustee	14.3 (4)	78.6 (22)	7.1 (2)
678	Full-time faculty	72.9 (494)	23.7 (161)	3.4 (23)
325	Part-time faculty	74.8 (243)	21.8 (71)	3.4 (11)
17	Student	58.8 (10)	35.3 (6)	5.9 (1)
12	President	25.0 (3)	75.0 (9)	-------
122	Administrator	54.9 (67)	41.8 (51)	3.3 (4)
67	Dept. or Div. Chairman	80.6 (54)	14.9 (10)	4.5 (3)
1249	TOTAL	70.1 (875)	26.4 (330)	3.5 (44)

4. DO YOU BELIEVE THAT ADMINISTRATORS--OTHER THAN THE PRESIDENT--SHOULD BE EMPOWERED TO BARGAIN INDEPENDENTLY?

TOTAL RESPONSES		YES	NO	NO RESPONSES
28	Trustee	35.7 (10)	64.3 (18)	-------
678	Full-time faculty	37.9 (257)	55.8 (378)	6.3 (43)
325	Part-time faculty	37.2 (121)	54.8 (178)	8.0 (26)
17	Student	35.3 (6)	64.7 (11)	-------
12	President	66.7 (8)	33.3 (4)	-------
122	Administrator	68.9 (84)	28.7 (35)	2.5 (3)
67	Dept. or Div. Chairman	55.2 (37)	40.3 (27)	4.5 (3)
1249	TOTAL	41.9 (523)	52.1 (651)	6.0 (75)

5. DO YOU BELIEVE THAT STUDENTS SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN THE BARGAINING PROCESS?

TOTAL RESPONSES		% YES	% NO	% NO RESPONSES
28	Trustee	17.9 (5)	82.1 (23)	-------
678	Full-time faculty	21.1 (143)	77.0 (522)	1.9 (13)
325	Part-time faculty	26.8 (87)	70.8 (230)	2.5 (8)
17	Student	82.4 (14)	17.6 (3)	-------
12	President	41.7 (5)	58.3 (7)	-------
122	Administrator	18.9 (23)	77.9 (95)	3.3 (4)
67	Dept. or Div. Chairman	11.9 (8)	82.1 (55)	6.0 (4)
1249	TOTAL	22.8 (285)	74.9 (935)	2.3 (29)

6. DO YOU FAVOR NEGOTIATIONS AT THE LOCAL LEVEL OR THE STATE LEVEL?

TOTAL RESPONSES		% LOCAL	% STATE	% NO RESPONSES
28	Trustee	82.1 (23)	17.9 (5)	-------
678	Full-time faculty	83.0 (563)	13.7 (93)	3.2 (22)
325	Part-time faculty	56.0 (182)	37.2 (121)	6.8 (22)
17	Student	94.1 (16)	5.9 (1)	-------
12	President	66.7 (8)	25.0 (3)	8.3 (1)
122	Administrator	69.7 (85)	28.7 (35)	1.6 (2)
67	Dept. or Div. Chairman	77.6 (52)	19.4 (13)	3.0 (2)
1249	TOTAL	74.4 (929)	21.7 (271)	3.9 (49

7. DO YOU BELIEVE THAT THERE SHOULD BE A STATEWIDE SALARY SCHEDULE FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACULTY?

TOTAL RESPONSES		% YES	% NO	% NO RESPONSES
28	Trustee	32.1 (9)	67.9 (19)	-------
678	Full-time faculty	23.2 (157)	74.5 (505)	2.4 (16)
325	Part-time faculty	58.5 (190)	38.2 (124)	3.4 (11)
17	Student	17.6 (3)	76.5 (13)	5.9 (1)
12	President	50.0 (6)	50.0 (6)	-------
122	Administrator	34.4 (42)	65.6 (80)	-------
67	Dept. or Div. Chairman	22.4 (15)	76.1 (51)	1.5 (1)
1249	TOTAL	33.8 (422)	63.9 (798)	2.3 (29)

"BUFF" RESPONSES

8. DO YOU BELIEVE THAT COLLECTIVE BARGAINING FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACULTY SHOULD BE LIMITED TO THE TRADITIONAL ECONOMIC ISSUES SUCH AS WAGES AND HOURS?

TOTAL RESPONSES		% YES	% NO	% NO RESPONSES
28	Trustee	64.3 (18)	28.6 (8)	7.1 (2)
678	Full-time faculty	8.8 (60)	90.1 (611)	1.0 (7)
325	Part-time faculty	22.5 (73)	76.0 (247)	1.5 (5)
17	Student	17.6 (3)	76.5 (13)	5.9 (1)
12	President	91.7 (11)	8.3 (1)	-------
122	Administrator	62.3 (76)	37.7 (46)	-------
67	Dept. or Div. Chairman	20.9 (14)	76.1 (51)	3.0 (2)
1249	TOTAL	20.4 (255)	78.2 (977)	1.4 (17)

9. WHICH OF THESE ALTERNATIVES BEST REPRESENT YOUR POSITION:

"BUFF" RESPONSES

TOTAL RESPONSES		OPPOSE COLL. BARG. IN COMM.COLLEGES	SUPPORT MODIFICATION OF PN LAW	SUPPORT A COMP. BARG.BILL FOR ED.--K-12, CC. & 4-YR. INSTIT.	SUPPORT COMM. COLLEGE COLL. BARG. BILL	SUPPORT HIER ED.BILL-COMM COLL.&4-YEAR INSTITUTIONS	SUPPORT ST. PUBLIC EMP.COLL.BARG.BILL TO INCLUDE COM.COLL	NO RESPONSE
28	Trustee	14.3 (4)	17.9 (5)	-------	35.7 (10)	21.4 (6)	3.6 (1)	7.1 (2)
678	Full-time faculty	1.9 (13)	1.9 (13)	17.6 (119)	33.9 (230)	26.1 (177)	7.8 (53)	10.8 (73)
325	Part-time faculty	5.5 (18)	1.0 (3)	24.0 (78)	25.5 (83)	21.2 (69)	9.2 (30)	13.5 (44)
17	Student	-------	5.9 (1)	-------	70.6 (12)	17.6 (3)	5.9 (1)	-------
12	President	-------	41.7 (5)	8.3 (1)	33.3 (4)	16.7 (2)	-------	-------
122	Administrator	8.2 (10)	6.6 (8)	11.5 (14)	29.4 (36)	23.0 (28)	10.7 (13)	10.7 (13)
67	Dept. or Div. Chairman	3.0 (47)	-------	6.0 (4)	37.3 (25)	31.3 (21)	11.9 (8)	10.4 (7)
1249	TOTAL	3.8 (47)	2.8 (35)	17.3 (216)	32.0 (400)	24.5 (306)	8.5 (106)	11.1 (139)

10. DO YOU BELIEVE THAT THE MAJOR DECISION MAKING ON YOUR CAMPUS SHOULD BE MADE BY:

TOTAL RESPONSES		COLLECTIVE BARGAINING	INTERNAL GOVERNANCE	BOTH	NO RESPONSE
28	Trustee	3.6 (1)	60.7 (17)	25.0 (7)	10.7 (3)
678	Full-time faculty	24.0 (163)	8.4 (57)	58.3 (395)	9.3 (63)
325	Part-time faculty	23.4 (76)	12.0 (39)	55.1 (179)	9.5 (31)
17	Student	23.5 (4)	23.5. (4)	52.9 (9)	-------
12	President	-------	58.3 (7)	33.3 (4)	8.3 (1)
122	Administrator	5.7 (7)	50.0 (61)	37.7 (46)	6.6 (8)
67	Dept. or Div. Chairman	14.9 (10)	13.4 (9)	65.7 (44)	6.0 (4)
1249	TOTAL	20.9 (261)	15.5 (194)	54.8 (684)	8.8 (110)

"GREEN" RESPONSES

2. DO YOU BELIEVE THAT A BARGAINING BILL SHOULD INCLUDE PART-TIME FACULTY IN THE BARGAINING UNIT?

TOTAL RESPONSES		YES	NO	NO RESPONSES
19	Trustee	36.8 (7)	57.9 (11)	5.3 (1)
428	Full-time faculty	62.4 (267)	35.3 (151)	2.3 (10)
127	Part-time faculty	62.2 (79)	37.8 (48)	---
4	Student	100.0 (4)	----	---
7	President	28.6 (2)	71.4 (5)	---
60	Administrator	30.0 (18)	66.7 (40)	3.3 (2)
34	Dept. or Div. Chairman	44.1 (15)	50.0 (17)	5.9 (2)
679	TOTAL	57.7 (392)	40.1 (272)	2.2 (15)

3. DO YOU BELIEVE THAT DEPARTMENT/DIVISION CHAIRMEN SHOULD BE IN THE BARGAINING UNIT?

TOTAL RESPONSES		YES	NO	NO RESPONSES
19	Trustee	42.1 (8)	42.1 (8)	15.8 (3)
428	Full-time faculty	71.3 (305)	25.7 (110)	3.0 (13)
127	Part-time faculty	59.1 (75)	37.8 (48)	3.1 (4)
4	Student	100.0 (4)	---	---
7	President	42.9 (3)	57.1 (4)	---
60	Administrator	61.7 (37)	36.7 (22)	1.7 (1)
34	Dept. or Div. Chairman	76.5 (26)	23.5 (8)	---
679	TOTAL	67.5 (458)	29.5 (200)	3.1 (21)

4. DO YOU BELIEVE THAT ADMINISTRATORS--OTHER THAN THE PRESIDENT--SHOULD BE EMPOWERED TO BARGAIN INDEPENDENTLY?

TOTAL RESPONSES		YES	NO	NO RESPONSES
19	Trustee	57.9 (11)	31.6 (6)	10.5 (2)
428	Full-time faculty	36.0 (154)	59.1 (253)	4.9 (21)
127	Part-time faculty	32.3 (41)	63.8 (81)	3.9 (5)
4	Student	---	75.0 (3)	25.0 (1)
7	President	71.4 (5)	28.6 (2)	---
60	Administrator	78.3 (47)	20.0 (12)	1.7 (1)
34	Dept. or Div. Chairman	47.1 (16)	50.0 (17)	2.9 (1)
679	TOTAL	40.4 (274)	55.1 (374)	4.6 (31)

"GREEN" RESPONSES

5. DO YOU BELIEVE THAT STUDENTS SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN THE BARGAINING PROCESS?

TOTAL RESPONSES		% YES	% NO	% NO RESPONSES
19	Trustee	5.3 (1)	89.5 (17)	5.3 (1)
428	Full-time faculty	15.0 (64)	81.3 (348)	3.7 (16)
127	Part-time faculty	17.3 (22)	81.9 (104)	0.8 (1)
4	Student	100.0 (4)	---	---
7	President	14.3 (1)	85.7 (6)	---
60	Administrator	25.0 (15)	75.0 (45)	---
34	Dept. or Div. Chairman	17.6 (6)	82.4 (28)	---
679	TOTAL	16.6 (113)	80.7 (548)	2.7 (18)

6. DO YOU FAVOR NEGOTIATIONS AT THE LOCAL LEVEL OR THE STATE LEVEL?

TOTAL RESPONSES		% LOCAL	% STATE	% NO RESPONSES
19	Trustee	57.9 (11)	42.1 (8)	---
428	Full-time faculty	50.2 (215)	45.1 (193)	4.7 (20)
127	Part-time faculty	36.2 (46)	56.7 (72)	7.1 (9)
4	Student	75.0 (3)	25.0 (1)	---
7	President	28.6 (2)	71.4 (5)	---
60	Administrator	53.3 (32)	43.3 (26)	3.3 (2)
34	Dept. or Div. Chairman	55.9 (19)	41.2 (14)	2.9 (1)
679	TOTAL	48.3 (328)	47.0 (319)	4.7 (32)

7. DO YOU BELIEVE THAT THERE SHOULD BE A STATEWIDE SALARY SCHEDULE FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACULTY?

TOTAL RESPONSES		% YES	% NO	% NO RESPONSES
19	Trustee	63.2 (12)	36.8 (7)	---
428	Full-time faculty	61.4 (263)	36.8 (7)	3.5 (15)
127	Part-time faculty	77.2 (98)	21.3 (27)	1.6 (2)
4	Student	75.0 (3)	25.0 (1)	---
7	President	100.0 (7)	---	---
60	Administrator	63.3 (38)	35.0 (21)	1.7 (1)
34	Dept. or Div. Chairman	47.1 (16)	44.1 (15)	8.8 (3)
679	TOTAL	64.4 (437)	32.5 (221)	3.1 (21)

"GREEN" RESPONSES

8. DO YOU BELIEVE THAT COLLECTIVE BARGAINING FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACULTY SHOULD BE LIMITED TO THE TRADITIONAL ECONOMIC ISSUES SUCH AS WAGES AND HOURS?

TOTAL RESPONSES		% YES	% NO	% NO RESPONSES
19	Trustee	68.4 (13)	15.8 (3)	15.8 (3)
428	Full-time faculty	15.4 (66)	82.7 (354)	1.9 (8)
127	Part-time faculty	35.4 (45)	63.0 (80)	1.6 (2)
4	Student	---	100.0 (4)	---
7	President	100.0 (7)	---	---
60	Administrator	50.0 (30)	50.0 (30)	---
34	Dept. or Div. Chairman	32.3 (11)	67.6 (23)	---
679	TOTAL	25.3 (172)	72.8 (494)	1.9 (13)

9. WHICH OF THESE ALTERNATIVES BEST REPRESENT YOUR POSITION:

TOTAL RESPONSES		"GREEN" RESPONSES: OPPOSE COLL. BARG. IN COMM.COLLEGES	SUPPORT MODIFICATION OF PN LAW	SUPPORT A COMP. BARG.BILL FOR ED.--K-12, CC. & 4-YR. INSTIT.	SUPPORT COMM. COLLEGE COLL. BARG. BILL	SUPPORT HIER ED.BILL-COMM COLL.&4-YEAR INSTITUTIONS	SUPPORT ST. PUBLIC EMP.COLL.BARG.BILL TO INCLUDE COM.COLL	NO RESPONSE
19	Trustee	31.6 (6)	10.5 (2)	5.3 (1)	21.0 (4)	15.8 (3)	---	15.8 (3)
428	Full-time faculty	4.0 (17)	4.0 (17)	13.3 (57)	40.7 (174)	16.8 (72)	8.9% (38)	12.3 (53)
127	Part-time faculty	6.3 (8)	11.0 (14)	19.7 (25)	33.9 (43)	13.4 (17)	11.0 (14)	4.7 (6)
4	Student	---	---	---	100.0 (4)	---	---	---
7	President	14.3 (1)	14.3 (1)	---	42.9 (3)	28.6 (2)	---	---
60	Administrator	5 (3)	13.3 (8)	10 (6)	45 (27)	13.3 (8)	5 (3)	8.3 (5)
34	Dept. or Div. Chairman	---	8.8 (3)	14.7 (5)	47.1 (16)	8.8 (3)	8.8 (3)	11.8 (4)
679	TOTAL	5.2 (35)	6.6 (45)	13.8 (94)	39.9 (271)	15.5 (105)	8.5 (58)	10.5 (71)

10. DO YOU BELIEVE THAT THE MAJOR DECISION MAKING ON YOUR CAMPUS SHOULD BE MADE BY:

TOTAL RESPONSES		COLLECTIVE BARGAINING	INTERNAL GOVERNANCE	BOTH	NO RESPONSE
19	Trustee	5.3 (1)	73.7 (14)	10.5 (2)	10.5 (2)
428	Full-time faculty	25.2 (108)	11.0 (47)	53.5 (229)	10.3 (44)
127	Part-time faculty	18.9 (24)	22.8 (29)	53.5 (68)	4.7 (6)
4	Student	---	---	100.0 (4)	---
7	President	---	57.1 (4)	42.9 (3)	---
60	Administrator	6.7 (4)	33.3 (20)	51.7 (31)	8.3 (5)
34	Dept. or Div. Chairman	5.9 (2)	14.7 (5)	73.5 (25)	5.9 (2)
679	TOTAL	20.5 (139)	17.5 (119)	53.3 (362)	8.7 (59)

"CANARY" RESPONSES

2. DO YOU BELIEVE THAT A BARGAINING BILL SHOULD INCLUDE PART-TIME FACULTY IN THE BARGAINING UNIT?

TOTAL RESPONSES		YES	NO	NO RESPONSES
15	Trustee	46.7% (7)	53.3% (8)	-----
55	Full-time faculty	78.2 (43)	20.0 (11)	1.8% (1)
62	Part-time faculty	87.1 (54)	11.3 (7)	1.6 (11)
4	Student	75.0 (3)	25.0 (1)	-----
3	President	33.3 (1)	66.7 (2)	-----
39	Administrator	76.9 (30)	23.1 (9)	-----
10	Dept. or Div. Chairman	90.0 (9)	10.0 (1)	-----
188	TOTAL	78.2 (147)	20.7 (39)	1.1 (2)

3. DO YOU BELIEVE THAT DEPARTMENT/DIVISION CHAIRMEN SHOULD BE IN THE BARGAINING UNIT?

TOTAL RESPONSES		YES	NO	NO RESPONSES
15	Trustee	26.7% (4)	73.3% (11)	-----
55	Full-time faculty	81.8 (45)	12.7 (7)	5.5% (3)
62	Part-time faculty	75.8 (47)	17.7 (11)	6.5 (4)
4	Student	75.0 (3)	-----	25.0 (1)
3	President	-----	100.0 (3)	-----
39	Administrator	61.5 (24)	38.5 (15)	-----
10	Dept. or Div. Chairman	100.0 (10)	-----	-----
188	TOTAL	70.7 (133)	25.0 (47)	4.3 (8)

4. DO YOU BELIEVE THAT ADMINISTRATORS--OTHER THAN THE PRESIDENT--SHOULD BE EMPOWERED TO BARGAIN INDEPENDENTLY?

TOTAL RESPONSES		YES	NO	NO RESPONSES
15	Trustee	73.3% (11)	26.7% (4)	-----
55	Full-time faculty	54.5 (30)	43.6 (24)	1.8% (1)
62	Part-time faculty	40.3 (25)	53.2 (33)	6.4 (4)
4	Student	25.0 (1)	75.0 (3)	-----
3	President	66.7 (2)	33.3 (1)	-----
39	Administrator	87.2 (34	12.8 (5)	-----
10	Dept. or Div. Chairman	60.0 (6)	40.0 (4)	-----
188	TOTAL	58.0 (109)	39.4 (74)	2.7 (5)

5. DO YOU BELIEVE THAT STUDENTS SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN THE BARGAINING PROCESS?

TOTAL RESPONSES		YES	NO	NO RESPONSES
15	Trustee	13.3% (2)	86.7% (13)	-----
55	Full-time faculty	21.8 (12)	78.2 (43)	-----
62	Part-time faculty	22.6 (14)	77.4 (48)	-----
4	Student	100.0 (4)	-----	-----
3	President	-----	100.0 (3)	-----
39	Administrator	35.9 (14)	64.1 (25)	-----
10	Dept. or Div. Chairman	-----	100.0 (10)	-----
188	TOTAL	24.5 (46)	75.5 (142)	-----

6. DO YOU FAVOR NEGOTIATIONS AT THE LOCAL LEVEL OR THE STATE LEVEL?

TOTAL RESPONSES		LOCAL	STATE	NO RESPONSES
15	Trustee	93.3% (14)	6.7% (1)	-----
55	Full-time faculty	43.6 (24)	54.5 (30)	1.8% (1)
62	Part-time faculty	56.5 (35)	40.3 (25)	3.2 (2)
4	Student	75.0 (3)	25.0 (1)	-----
3	President	66.7 (2)	33.3 (1)	-----
39	Administrator	59.0 (23)	38.5 (15)	2.6 (1)
10	Dept. or Div. Chairman	50.0 (5)	50.0 (5)	-----
188	TOTAL	56.4 (106)	41.5 (78)	2.1 (4)

7. DO YOU BELIEVE THAT THERE SHOULD BE A STATEWIDE SALARY SCHEDULE FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACULTY?

TOTAL RESPONSES		YES	NO	NO RESPONSES
15	Trustee	40.0% (6)	60.0% (9)	-----
55	Full-time faculty	74.5 (41)	25.5 (14)	-----
62	Part-time faculty	71.0 (44)	22.6 (14)	6.5% (4)
4	Student	25.0 (1)	75.0 (3)	-----
3	President	66.7 (2)	33.3 (1)	-----
39	Administrator	53.8 (21)	46.2 (18)	-----
10	Dept. or Div. Chairman	60.0 (6)	40.0 (4)	-----
188	TOTAL	64.4 (121)	33.5 (63)	2.1 (4)

8. DO YOU BELIEVE THAT COLLECTIVE BARGAINING FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACULTY SHOULD BE LIMITED TO THE TRADITIONAL ECONOMIC ISSUES SUCH AS WAGES AND HOURS?

TOTAL RESPONSES		YES	NO	NO RESPONSES
15	Trustee	73.3% (11)	20.0% (3)	6.7% (1)
55	Full-time faculty	12.7 (7)	87.3 (48)	-----
62	Part-time faculty	14.5 (9)	75.8 (47)	9.7 (6)
4	Student	50.0 (2)	50.0 (2)	-----
3	President	100.0 (3)	-----	-----
39	Administrator	53.8 (21)	42.6 (18)	-----
10	Dept. or Div. Chairman	10.0 (1)	90.0 (9)	-----
188	TOTAL	28.7 (54)	67.6 (127)	3.7 (7)

9. WHICH OF THESE ALTERNATIVES BEST REPRESENT YOUR POSITION:

"CANARY" RESPONSES

TOTAL RESPONSES		OPPOSE COLL. BARG. IN COMM.COLLEGES	SUPPORT MODIFICATION OF PN LAW	SUPPORT A COMP. BARG.BILL FOR ED.--K-12, CC. & 4-YR. INSTIT.	SUPPORT COMM. COLLEGE COLL. BARG. BILL	SUPPORT HIER ED.BILL-COMM COLL.&4-YEAR INSTITUTIONS	SUPPORT ST. PUBLIC EMP.COLL.BARG.BILL TO INCLUDE COM.COLL	NO RESPONSE
15	Trustee	60.0% (9)	-----	-----	40.0% (6)	-----	-----	-----
55	Full-time faculty	-----	1.8% (1)	27.3% (15)	34.5 (19)	12.7% (7)	10.9% (6)	12.7% (7)
62	Part-time faculty	11.3 (7)	-----	21.0 (13)	27.4 (17)	21.0 (13)	3.2 (2)	16.1 (10)
4	Student	-----	-----	-----	25.0 (1)	50.0 (2)	25.0 (1)	-----
3	President	33.3 (1)	-----	-----	33.3 (1)	33.3 (1)	-----	-----
39	Administrator	12.8 (5)	-----	7.7 (3)	38.5 (15	23.1 (9)	2.6 (1)	15.4 (6)
10	Dept. or Div. Chairman	-----	-----	20.0 (2)	40.0 (4)	20.0 (2)	-----	20.0 (2)
188	TOTAL	11.7 (22)	0.1 (1)	17.6 (33)	33.5 (63)	18.1 (34)	5.3 (10)	13.3 (25)

10. DO YOU BELIEVE THAT THE MAJOR DECISION MAKING ON YOUR CAMPUS SHOULD BE MADE BY:

TOTAL RESPONSES		COLLECTIVE BARGAINING	INTERNAL GOVERNANCE	BOTH	NO RESPONSE
15	Trustee	6.7% (1)	73.3% (11)	13.3% (2)	6.7% (1)
55	Full-time faculty	29.1 (16)	12.7 (7)	56.4 (31)	1.8 (1)
62	Part-time faculty	27.7 (11)	21.0 (13)	53.2 (33)	8.1 (5)
4	Student	25.0 (1)	25.0 (1)	50.0 (2)	-----
3	President	-----	100.0 (3)	-----	-----
39	Administrator	-----	35.9 (14)	56.4 (22)	7.7 (3)
10	Dept. or Div. Chairman	20.0 (2)	10.0 (1)	70.0 (7)	-----
188	TOTAL	16.5 (31)	26.6 (50)	51.6 (97)	5.3 (10)

28B.50.869 Faculty tenure——Review committees, composition——Selection of teaching faculty representatives; student representative. The review committees required by RCW 28B.50.850 through 28B.50.869 shall be composed of members of the administrative staff, a student representative, and the teaching faculty. The representatives of the teaching faculty shall represent a majority of the members on each review committee. The members representing the teaching faculty on each review committee shall be selected by a majority of the teaching faculty and faculty department heads acting in a body. The student representative, who shall be a full time student, shall be chosen by the student association of the particular community college in such manner as the members thereof shall determine. [1974 1st ex.s. c 33 § 2; 1969 ex.s. c 283 § 45. Formerly RCW 28.85.869.]

Severability——1969 ex.s. c 283: See note following RCW 28A.02.061.

28B.50.875 Laboratory services for the analyzing of samples, public agencies may contract with college for. Local law enforcement agencies or such other public agencies that shall be in need of such service may contract with any community college for laboratory services for the analyzing of samples that chemists associated with such community colleges may be able to perform under such terms and conditions as the individual community college may determine. [1969 ex.s. c 261 § 35. Formerly RCW 28.85.875.]

Severability——1969 ex.s. c 261: See note following RCW 28B.50.020.

28B.50.910 Severability——1969 ex.s. c 223. If any provision of this act, or its application to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the act, or the application of the provision to other persons or circumstances is not affected. [1969 ex.s. c 223 § 28B-.50.910. Prior: 1967 ex.s. c 8 § 72. Formerly RCW 28.85.910.]

Chapter 28B.52
NEGOTIATIONS BY ACADEMIC PERSONNEL——COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICTS

Sections

28B.52.010 Declaration of purpose.
28B.52.020 Definitions.
28B.52.030 Negotiation by representatives of employee organization——Authorized——Subject matter.
28B.52.035 Negotiations reduced to written agreements——Restrictions.
28B.52.050 Academic employee may appear in own behalf.
28B.52.060 Advisory committee——Compensation——Report——Recommendations, effect——Fact finding and mediation activities.
28B.52.070 Discrimination prohibited.
28B.52.080 Boards to adopt rules and regulations——Request for department services.
28B.52.090 Prior agreements.
28B.52.100 State higher education administrative procedures act not to affect.
28B.52.200 Chapter's scope limited.

28B.52.010 Declaration of purpose. It is the purpose of this chapter to strengthen methods of administering employer-employee relations through the establishment of orderly methods of communication between academic employees and the community college districts by which they are employed. [1971 ex.s. c 196 § 1.]

28B.52.020 Definitions. As used in this chapter:

"Employee organization" means any organization which includes as members the academic employees of a community college district and which has as one of its purposes the representation of the employees in their employment relations with the community college district.

"Academic employee" means any teacher, counselor, librarian, or department head, who is employed by any community college district, with the exception of the chief administrative officer of, and any administrator in, each community college district.

"Administrator" means any person employed either full or part time by the community college district and who performs administrative functions as at least fifty percent or more of his assignments, and has responsibilities to hire, dismiss, or discipline other employees. Administrators shall not be members of the bargaining unit unless a majority of such administrators and a majority of the bargaining unit elect by secret ballot for such inclusion pursuant to rules and regulations as adopted in accordance with RCW 28B.52.080. [1973 1st ex.s. c 205 § 1; 1971 ex.s. c 196 § 2.]

Severability——1973 1st ex.s. c 205: "If any provision of this 1973 amendatory act, or its application to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the act, or the application of the provision to other persons or circumstances is not affected." [1973 1st ex.s. c 205 § 7.] This applies to RCW 28B.52.020, 28B.52.030, 28B.52.035, 28B.52.060, 28B.52.080 and 28B.52.200.

28B.52.030 Negotiation by representatives of employee organization——Authorized——Subject matter. Representatives of an employee organization, which organization shall by secret ballot have won a majority in an election to represent the academic employees within its community college district, shall have the right, after using established administrative channels, to meet, confer and negotiate with the board of trustees of the community college district or its delegated representative(s) to communicate the considered professional judgment of the academic staff prior to the final adoption by the board of proposed community college district policies relating to, but not limited to, curriculum, textbook selection, in-service training, student teaching programs, personnel, hiring and assignment practices, leaves of absence, salaries and salary schedules and noninstructional duties. [1973 1st ex.s. c 205 § 2; 1971 ex.s. c 196 § 3.]

Severability——1973 1st ex.s. c 205: See note following RCW 28B.52.020.

28B.52.035 Negotiations reduced to written agreements——Restrictions. At the conclusion of any negotiation processes as provided for in RCW 28B.52.030, any matter upon which the parties have reached agreement shall be reduced to writing and acted upon in a

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES
1975
CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

regular or special meeting of the boards of trustees, and become part of the official proceedings of said board meeting. The length of terms within any such agreement shall be for not more than three fiscal years. These agreements will not be binding upon future actions of the legislature. [1973 1st ex.s. c 205 § 4.]

Severability——1973 1st ex.s. c 205: See note following RCW 28B.52.020.

28B.52.050 Academic employee may appear in own behalf. Nothing in this chapter shall prohibit any academic employee from appearing in his own behalf on matters relating to his employment relations with the community college district. [1971 ex.s. c 196 § 4.]

28B.52.060 Advisory committee——Compensation——Report——Recommendations, effect——Fact-finding and mediation activities. In addition to the authority to convene an impasse committee, the director of the state system of community colleges is authorized to conduct fact-finding and mediation activities upon the consent of both parties as a means of assisting in the settlement of unresolved matters considered under this chapter.

In the event that any matter being jointly considered by the employee organization and the board of trustees of the community college district is not settled by the means provided in this chapter, either party, twenty-four hours after serving written notice of its intended action to the other party, may, with the concurrence of the director, request the assistance and advice of a committee appointed by the director. This committee may make a written report with recommendations to both parties within twenty calendar days of receipt of the request for assistance. Any recommendations of the committee shall be advisory only and not binding upon the board of trustees or the employee organization.

The state board for community college education is authorized to make rules governing the operations of impasse committees. [1973 1st ex.s. c 205 § 3; 1971 ex.s. c 196 § 5.]

Severability——1973 1st ex.s. c 205: See note following RCW 28B.52.020.

28B.52.070 Discrimination prohibited. Boards of trustees of community college districts or any administrative officer thereof shall not discriminate against academic employees or applicants for such positions because of their membership or nonmembership in employee organizations or their exercise of other rights under this chapter. [1971 ex.s. c 196 § 6.]

28B.52.080 Boards to adopt rules and regulations——Request for department services. Boards of trustees of community college districts shall adopt reasonable rules and regulations for the administration of employer-employee relations under this chapter. The boards may request the services of the department of labor and industries to assist in the conduction of certification elections as provided for in RCW 28B.52.030. [1973 1st ex.s. c 205 § 5; 1971 ex.s. c 196 § 7.]

Severability——1973 1st ex.s. c 205: See note following RCW 28B.52.020.

28B.52.090 Prior agreements. Nothing in this chapter shall be construed to annul or modify, or to preclude the renewal or continuation of, any lawful agreement heretofore entered into between any community college district and any representative of its employees. [1971 ex.s. c 196 § 8.]

28B.52.100 State higher education administrative procedures act not to affect. Contracts or agreements, or any provision thereof entered into between boards of trustees and employees organizations pursuant to this chapter shall not be affected by or be subject to chapter 28B.19 RCW. [1971 ex.s. c 196 § 9.]

28B.52.200 Chapter's scope limited. Nothing in chapter 28B.52 RCW as now or hereafter amended shall compel either party to agree to a proposal or to make a concession, nor shall any provision in chapter 28B.52 RCW as now or hereafter amended be construed as limiting or precluding the exercise by each community college board of trustees of any powers or duties authorized or provided to it by law unless such exercise is contrary to the terms and conditions of any lawful negotiated agreement. [1973 1st ex.s. c 205 § 6.]

Severability——1973 1st ex.s. c 205: See note following RCW 28B.52.020.

Chapter 28B.56
1972 COMMUNITY COLLEGES FACILITIES AID——BOND ISSUE

Sections

28B.56.010 Purpose.
28B.56.020 Bonds authorized——Payment——Limitations.
28B.56.030 Community college capital improvements account——Created——Deposits in——Use of funds from.
28B.56.040 Proceeds from bond sale——Administration and expenditure.
28B.56.050 "Community college facilities" defined.
28B.56.060 List of projects to be funded——Planning funds, limitations on.
28B.56.070 Referral to electorate.
28B.56.080 Form, terms, conditions and manner of sale and issuance——Limitation.
28B.56.090 Anticipation notes——Authorized——Contents——Payment.
28B.56.100 Community college capital improvements bond redemption fund of 1972——Created——Tax receipts in——Use of funds from.
28B.56.110 Legislature may provide additional means of revenue.
28B.56.120 Bonds as legal investment for state and municipal corporation funds.

28B.56.010 Purpose. The community colleges of the state of Washington have more than doubled their enrollment since 1966, including a three hundred percent increase in occupational education. The capital fund resources of the state community college system are not adequate to meet the facility needs of today's students. Major increments of community college facilities will be needed to serve the still growing numbers of commuting